MNEMOSYNE
BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT
A. D. LEEMAN · H. W. PLEKET · W. J. VERDENIUS
BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT
W. J. VERDENIUS, HOMERUSLAAN 53, ZEIST

SUPPLEMENTUM SEPTUAGESIMUM TERTIUM

WALTER MOSKALEW
FORMULAR LANGUAGE
AND POETIC DESIGN
IN THE *AENEID*

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM E. J. BRILL MCMLXXXII

FORMULAR LANGUAGE AND POETIC DESIGN IN THE *AENEID*

BY

WALTER MOSKALEW

LEIDEN E. J. BRILL 1982

CONTENTS

Preface IX

Chapter One: Introduction 1

Chapter Two: Repetition, Genre, and Style 21

I. Frequency of Repetition 22

II. Repetition and Style 26
A. Homoeokatarkton and Homoeoteleuton 26
1. Homoeokatarkton 28
2. Homoeoteleuton 33
3. Homoeokatarkton, Homoeoteleuton, and Repetition 38
B. Some Aspects of the Bucolic Style 39

III. Repetition and the Epic Genre 55
A. The Tradition 55
B. The Use of Formulae in the *Aeneid* 63
1. Speaking Formulae 63
2. Dawn and Night Formulae 66

Chapter Three: Design and Texture 73

I. Texture 80
A. Epithets and Characters 80
1. Simple Noun-Epithet Formulae 81
2. Complex Epithets 86
3. Combinations of Characters 87
4. Descriptions of Characters 88
B. Action, Circumstance, and Narrative 90
1. Prayer and Sacrifice 90
2. Battle 91
3. Sea 93
4. Nature and Artifact 94
5. Action and Reaction 95
C. Emphasis and Continuity 99

II. Design . . . 108
A. Quotations . . . 108
1. Answer . . . 108
2. Affirmation . . . 109
3. Fulfilment . . . 114
B. Ring Composition . . . 116
C. Thematic Association . . . 122
1. Analogy . . . 123
2. Contrast . . . 126
3. Foreshadowing . . . 131

Chapter Four: Patterns of Association . . . 135

A. Aeneas . . . 135
1. The Great Tradition . . . 135
2. Dardanus . . . 140
3. *Pietatis Imago* . . . 140
4. *Augurium Maximum* . . . 141
5. Prayers and Sacrifices . . . 143
6. The *Aristeia* of Ascanius . . . 147
7. Venus, Anchises, and Creusa . . . 150
8. Neoptolemus . . . 152
B. Dido . . . 156
1. Latinus . . . 162
2. Juno . . . 164
3. Helen . . . 169
4. Amata . . . 170
5. Laomedon . . . 172
6. Evander . . . 175
7. Pallas . . . 178

Appendix: List of Repetitions . . . 184
Bibliography . . . 246
Index Locorum . . . 255

PREFACE

We are taught at an early age that repetition can be tedious and should therefore be avoided, but like all rules of thumb this can substitute habit for telling good from bad. Even when we attempt to discriminate, there still subsists a sense that repetition is somehow incompatible with careful writing—except, of course, where the repetition is 'effective'. Yet any effectiveness depends on the reader's ability and willingness to perceive it, which means that it is subject to those biases and expectations we bring to a text. Exactly this is our problem when we approach a work such as the *Aeneid*, which is unfinished and full of repetitions. Should we resort to apology—because Vergil might still have changed them? Or should we assume that many may be intended—and risk misinterpreting the poem? Prudence commends the first course. I have chosen the other, because it promised to be more instructive.

Self-conscious art need not preclude language that is highly repetitive, perhaps formulaic. But this is not readily demonstrated, so that my procedure has been variously quantitative, descriptive, analytical, interpretive. Frequency statistics on repetition in Vergil's works show marked differences even between the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics*. Unless we wish to believe that these simply reflect degrees of care and carelessness, we cannot assume the existence of a uniform Vergilian style and thus expect that a revised *Aeneid* would have been more like his earlier works. There are other possibilities. Vergil's style may have changed in the course of time; or external warrants such as subject matter, perceived generic patterns, or specific literary models may have significantly affected his use of repetition. By assessing the force of such influences I have tried to get some sense of the artistic control he will have exerted. Such considerations form a necessary prelude to the more interpretive part of this book, which finally concerns itself less with the origin, the mechanics, or the psychology of repetition, than with its function and effectiveness,—so as to show how the repetitions in the *Aeneid* contribute to the grain or texture of the poem, and how by establishing various associations formular language embodies the work's poetic design.

Past studies of Vergilian repetition had provided collections and lists of repeated lines and phrases, but none of them were comprehensive, and that made comparisons among the different Vergilian works unreliable. I have expanded this nucleus first with the help of Merguet's *Lexikon* and

finally by reading through Warwick's *Concordance.* The result, which appears in my *Appendix*, has been carefully checked against Mynors' Vergil text. I did not use a computer, although at various times I was advised to do so. I am not sure it would have lessened my toil, and I would have missed much, for many unexpected things surfaced in the course of slowly going through the *Concordance.* It is a task I do not wish to repeat in this lifetime, but it yielded a mass of interesting material and offered insights into the workings of Vergil's poetic art and language that I could not have gained in any other way.

The multiplicity of issues examined here, given the immense bulk of what has been written on Vergil, made bibliographical comprehensiveness an unrealistic goal. Several exhaustive bibliographies are readily available, the most extensive and useful of which have recently appeared in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt.* My bibliography is largely confined to works cited in the notes (by year of publication). I have tried to indicate where orthodox positions differ substantially from mine, and to credit other scholars where they have influenced or anticipated my views. Omissions there surely are, for our real debts always exceed our awareness of them.

I have had support from various sources, which I gratefully acknowledge here. A fellowship from the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst enabled me to begin work in the not-so-tranquil surroundings of the Free University, West Berlin, in 1967-68. Vassar College gave me a research leave for 1980-81, which allowed me to finish my last revisions; and grants from the Haight and Salmon Funds: these provided a generous subvention, defrayed the cost of preparing the manuscript, and helped in the proofreading of a text of no small complexity.

This study began as a Yale University dissertation and has since passed through several revisions, the last of which was completed in December 1980. The dissertation was largely indebted to three men: Professor G. N. Knauer, who had suggested the topic to me, freely imparted his own observations on the subject and gave the finished product much valuable criticism. Professor Eric Havelock guided my early struggles with the material and deeply influenced my understanding of the *Aeneid.* Professor Thomas Cole with patient encouragement and rigorous attention to matters of argumentation and form greatly helped to bring clarity to the main issues. There were also others, and time has lengthened their list: initial drafts of several chapters were read by Professors David Konstan, Otto Skutsch, and Erik Wistrand; the completed dissertation, by Professors Jeffrey Henderson and Gordon Williams; an early revision, by Professor R.

E. H. Westendorp Boerma, who accepted it for the *Mnemosyne* series. Their gracious criticism and comments have saved me from numerous blunders and helped to firm my case at many points. Two colleagues at Vassar College must also be mentioned. Professor Julia McGrew read a penultimate version of the book; her favorable response to what I was doing hastened the completion of the work more than she realizes. Professor James Day offered invaluable advice on many matters of substance and style, and generously helped in the arduous task of correcting proofs. I could not have asked for a more exacting reader: if my style has any merit, it is largely because I have often found myself writing for his perceptive ear and discerning eye. Finally, I owe much to Professor William Magrath, who has often been the first to hear my ideas— and the first to see their flaws or to share in the excitement. Ms. Mary Nergenah Haney and Mr. Thomas Edwards checked the *Appendix* against the Vergil text. Ms. Lauren MacGregor Phillips applied her usual good judgment and meticulous care to the reading of proofs. The staff of E. J. Brill prepared a difficult text with courtesy, promptness, and exemplary accuracy. All these have helped to make the book better than it might have been. If it falls short of what it should be, the fault is mine alone.

Thanks of a more personal kind remain to be expressed:

To my mother for her unfailing faith.

To Zinta for the generosity of her forebearance.

To Barbara, who knows well the book's growing-pains and who now can share the joy at its coming of age.

W.M.

Vassar College
Poughkeepsie, New York
January 1982

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Vergilian scholars have only intermittently focused their attention on the repeated lines in the *Aeneid*. For the most part they have been content to cite parallels, but comment little or not at all on their significance. It was usually assumed that Vergil was imitating Homer's epic formulae, and since this idea was not challenged, it came to be regarded as an obvious fact requiring neither proof nor explication. When as a result of F. A. Wolf's *Prolegomena ad Homerum* scholars turned to the repetitions in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* for a possible answer to the so-called Homeric Question, interest in Vergilian repetition also increased, but it occasioned little fervor and less controversy. There was, after all, neither an analogous Vergilian Question to spur on research, nor the promise that analysis of such repetition would appreciably alter opinions about the *Aeneid* held since antiquity.

The influence of nineteenth-century Homeric scholarship on the study of Vergilian repetition has been far from salutary. Homeric scholars, hoping to distinguish the different compositional strands in the epics, had devoted their energies primarily to the questions of priority, authenticity, and interpolation. The criteria that came to be established have had some application to Homer, but were much less relevant in a literary epic. Preoccupation with such questions emphasized the process of composition at the expense of the work's content, form, or meaning, and as a result the possibility of repetitions having some artistic function was largely ignored. There was a tendency to apply modern aesthetic standards and to fault Vergil for overindulgence in a device of dubious merit, or to assume that he probably would have recast the most offensive repetitions had he only lived to finish his poem. What suited the naive style of the Greek bard seemed inappropriate in the highly self-conscious art of an Augustan poet whose care in composition had been described by Donatus and praised by Quintilian. It was also difficult to reconcile the vast number of repetitions in the *Aeneid* with the studied elegance of the *Georgics*, and rather than allow for differences in poetic style, critics preferred to remove contradictions by condemning whatever lines offended their notion of Vergil's art. Such emphasis on incongruities and interpolations may have shed some light on textual problems, but it has done little to further our understanding of

Vergilian repetition, for by postulating that the troublesome verses were either spurious or temporary stopgaps, which would have been removed in the final revision, it had in fact managed to avoid the problem altogether. This tendency to regard the repetitions in the *Aeneid* as either blemishes or textual problems seems to date mostly from the nineteenth century. Earlier commentators and most ancient critics have very little to say about repetition, which suggests that they did not find it particularly offensive.

There are a few examples. Servius D. quotes Probus on 4.418 (*puppibus et laeti nautae imposuere coronas*), who would have liked to remove this line from the text—*si hunc versum omitteret, melius fecisset.* We need not assume that Probus objected just because the line is repeated from *G* 1.304. Most likely he had some difficulty in reconciling the placing of ceremonial wreaths on the ships with the apparently hasty and clandestine preparations for Aeneas' departure, a difficulty perceived also by Servius D. and many (*multi*) others.[1] Another comment of Probus is preserved by Servius D. in the note on 9.814 (*fessos quatit aeger anhelitus artus*):

> Probus ait commodius hic est 'aeger' quam in quinto (432) 'vastos quatit aeger anhelitus artus': *quamvis consuetudo sit Vergilio ista mutandi.*

But while he correctly recognized Vergil's penchant for variation, it does not follow from this that he objected to repetition. His main concern seems to have been with lines and phrases not adequately accommodated to their contexts.

The fragmentary commentary attributed to Probus gives a few examples of effective phrase and word repetition in the note on *E* 4.58, and ends with the observation: *ne sit mirum, hic quoque iterationem a poeta frequentatam.* In the same commentary there is also a discussion of the bucolic style in which 1.607-608 is compared with *E* 1.59-60 (Thilo-Hagen IIIb, p. 327):

> sunt quaedam propria, heroico carmini sublimia, sed in bucolico humilia, quae apte divisisse Vergilius notatus est. Nam cum Aeneas gratias Didoni ageret eiusque se, quamdiu natura rerum stetisset, memoriam habiturum confitetur, sic est:
>
> in freta dum fluvii current, dum montibus umbrae
> lustrabunt, convexa polus dum sidera pascet.
>
> Sic et Tityrus, cum beneficiis Augusti gratias ageret, rerum naturae perpetuitatem congruentibus sensibus tractavit sic:
>
> ante leves ergo pascentur in aethere cervi
> et freta destituent nudos in litore pisces.

[1] See Georgii (1891: 220-21).

The author must have been aware of the much closer parallel between 1.607-609 and *E* 5.76-78, where the last line is an exact repetition:

> dum iuga montis aper, fluvios dum piscis amabit,
> dumque thymo pascentur apes, dum rore cicadae,
> *semper honos nomenque tuum laudesque manebunt,*

but he makes no mention of this. Evidently he was struck less by the repetition than by the different treatment accorded the same idea in epic and pastoral.

Macrobius likewise concerns himself mostly with variation and rhetorical repetition. In *Sat.* 4.6.23 he remarks on the effectiveness of anaphora—*nascitur pathos et de repetitione*, and gives several examples (*G* 4.525-27, *G* 4.465-66, 7.759-60). He notes the pleasing effect produced by the repetition of *Pan etiam, Arcadia* in *E* 4.58-60—*sunt amoenae repetitiones quas non fugit* (*Sat.* 5.14.6). That he was also aware of repetitions used at greater distances from one another is clear from the remark of Avienus (*Sat.* 2.1.1) praising Vergil for his skill in adapting the same verse to different situations (1.216 = 723)—*tumultuosum et sobrium uno eodemque versu descripsit sub paucorum verborum immutatione convivium.* Here the variation is obviously determined by the context and not by a desire to avoid exact verbal repetition. Only when Macrobius compares the catalogues of Homer and Vergil (*Sat.* 5.15.14-15) does he suggest that the latter pursues variation for its own sake:

> deinde in catalogo suo curavit Vergilius vitare fastidium, quod Homerus alia ratione non cavit eadem figura saepe repetita... hic autem variat velut dedecus aut crimen vitans repetitionem.

But while he observes that Vergil avoids repetition in the catalogue as if it were a fault, he also notes its effectiveness in Homer—*sed nescio quo modo Homerum repetitio illa unice decet* (*Sat.* 5.15.16). There are obvious differences between the styles of Homer and Vergil, which become particularly apparent in the treatment of traditional themes such as catalogues of warriors. But these constitute special cases, and Vergil's practice here does not necessarily imply that he also avoided the less obvious types of repetition. Macrobius does not proclaim a general stylistic principle, but rather illustrates how Vergil responded to the specific challenge of composing a catalogue.

The commentary of Servius is not much more illuminating, for though it often quotes repetitions, it rarely ventures to discuss them. Of the few remarks we do have, the most significant is probably the note that the

repetition *tum sic adfari et curas his demere dictis* was missing in many MSS at 2.775 and 3.153—*et hic versus in plerisque dicitur non fuisse* (Servius D. on 2.775), *hic versus in multis non invenitur* (Servius D. on 3.153). This has led Ribbeck and others to athetize one line or the other as an interpolation, although later editors follow the mainstream of the MS tradition and retain both. Servius' remark is of some importance, because it illustrates the existence of a variant textual tradition in his time, but we need not assume that the majority was right, that the *plerique* and *multi* represented a superior tradition rather than a popular recension.[2] As so often, Servius makes no personal judgment on this matter. But even if these lines are interpolated, it does not follow that repetitions are interpolated elsewhere just because they are here. Servius comments on a specific textual problem, not a general stylistic tendency or an artistic credo.

Servius was obviously aware of the many other repeated phrases and lines, as is amply attested by his many references to parallel passages,[3] but nowhere, except in the quotations from Probus discussed above, do we find even a trace of criticism. Presumably the repetitions were not found objectionable. When Servius does comment on some of them, it is usually to point out their effectiveness, as on *E* 8.5:

> 'Damonis Musam' bene repetit, ne longum hyperbaton sensum confunderet, ut in Georgicis repetit 'huc pater o Lenaee';

or on *E* 8.50:

> 'improbus ille puer, crudelis tu quoque mater', non est superflua haec verborum iteratio: nam syllogismus est plenus, qui constat ex propositione, assumptione, conclusione.

The effect of these repetitions is essentially rhetorical and easily perceived, because they recur within very short passages. Repetitions occurring at greater distances from one another probably do not elicit special comment, because their effect is much less obvious.

The other scholia are even less helpful than Servius. Neither Philargyrius nor the Verona Scholia comment on repetitions, or even cite them. One remark of the anonymous *Brevis Expositio Vergilii Georgicorum* implies that the author was aware that *G* 2.481 (*quid tantum Oceano properent se tingere soles*) is repeated in 1.745. The Berne Scholia have a few scattered notes:

E 1.4 *nos patriam*, iteratio.

E 5.86 *ardebat Alexim*, sic te diligimus.
docuit, cecinit, id est illa cicuta tibi dabitur, in qua illud expressum est carmen: 'dic mihi Damoeta' et reliqua.

E 8.21 hi versus 'calares' dicuntur quia subinde repetuntur, et ornatus causa per schema hoc facitur.

G 2.173 *Salve*, pro adoratione positum est, ut (5.80): 'Salve, sancte parens.'

To be sure, what has come down to us from the work of ancient commentators on Vergil is rather fragmentary. It is conceivable that a number of them were much more critical of repetitions, but it seems unlikely that any serious attacks on his use of repetition would have been so completely passed over by Macrobius and Servius. One might object that it is hazardous to assign an artistic function to Vergilian repetition, when none of the ancients seem to have been aware of it. Yet surely Vergil's art cannot be defined by the limited perspective of commentators, whose preoccupation with grammatical, rhetorical, and antiquarian detail so often dulls their sensitivity to the poetry of the epic.

The silence of the commentators is not surprising in an age when literature was valued primarily as a training ground for orators and when versified rhetoric passed for poetry. By then Vergil had already become canonized as master poet and rhetorician—*invenies in poeta rhetorem summum* (Ti. Claudius Donatus, *Proem.*), and the scholiasts were eager to demonstrate this at every turn.[4] This interest in Vergil's rhetorical skill has probably led the ancients to emphasize obvious effects over more subtle ones, and rhetorical repetition[5] over possible structural or artistic

[2] Other comments of Servius show that he had access to, or at least knew of, an inferior textual tradition: Servius D. on 1.150—*multi non 'volant' sed 'volunt' invenisse se dicunt*; Serv. D. on 4.204 NUMINA—*sane multi 'munera' legunt*; Serv. D. on 4.348 DETINET—*sane quidam in novis et emendatis libris pro 'detinet' 'demeret' inventum adserunt.* Cf. also other variants noted on 7.26, 7.568, 7.801, 9.369, 9.814, 10.481, 11.152, 11.801.

[3] Cf. 1.55 (= 124 Serv. D.), 1.216 (= 723 Serv. D.), 1.245 (= 55 Serv.), 1.723 (= 216 Serv.), 3.163-66 (= 1.530-33 Serv./Serv. D.), 4.412 (= 3.56 Serv.), 5.235 (= 6.264 Serv.), 6.39 (= 4.57 Serv.), 6.176 (= 1.220 Serv.), 6.635 (= 424 Serv.), 6.797 (= 4.482 Serv.), 8.43 (= 3.390 Serv.), 8.80 (= 3.471 Serv. D.), 9.110 (= 731 Serv./Serv. D.), 9.236 (= 189 Serv. D.), 10.85 (= 25 Serv.), 11.831 (= 12.952 Serv.), 11.885 (= 2.411 Serv./Serv. D.), 12.952 (= 11.831 Serv.). The comments on 3.589 and 4.7 are very similar and suggest that Servius was probably aware of the repetition. On the other hand, no mention whatever is made of the storm repeated in 5.8-11 from 3.192-95, but it is difficult to imagine how such a lengthy repetition could have escaped his notice.

[4] Cf. also Macrob. *Sat.* 1.24.8, 5.1.1, and the brief but useful summary in D'Alton (1931: 456-63). For the relationship between Vergilian art and rhetoric see Heinze (1915: 431-35), Norden (1927: 376-90), M. L. Clarke (1949), and now Highet (1972: esp. 3-12, 47-48, 56-60, 90-92, 97, 277-90). On the narrowness and superficiality of much ancient literary criticism, cf. Kroll (1924: 124-38).

[5] Cf. *Rhet. Her.* 4.12.18-28, 38; Quint. *Inst.* 9.3.28-88; Lausberg (1960: 308-374).

repetition. Moreover, rhetorical effects are best perceived within the framework of a sentence or paragraph, and that is why commentators have tended to concentrate on the smaller structures to the exclusion of larger thematic developments and allusions. What rhetoricians have to say about the use and avoidance of repetition[6] provides the scholia with a rhetorical foundation, but it helps us little in understanding Vergil's use of repetition. We must beware of trying to force the *Aeneid* to fit the rhetorical theories of the times. The failure of commentators to perceive or note other kinds of repetition does not mean that Vergil could not have used them. In the final analysis, only a careful reading of the poem itself is likely to provide an answer.

The problem, however, is complicated by the incomplete state in which Vergil left the *Aeneid*. It is generally agreed that he would have made some changes, but it is hard to say what these changes would have been. Aelius Donatus is not very helpful here (*Vita Verg.* 23-24):

> Aeneida prosa prius oratione formatam digestamque in XII libros particulatim componere instituit, prout liberet quidque, et nihil in ordinem arripiens. ac ne quid impetum moraretur, quaedam imperfecta transmisit, alia levissimis versibus veluti fulsit, quae per iocum pro tibicinibus interponi aiebat ad sustinendum opus, donec solidae columnae advenirent.

Presumably *imperfecta* are metrically incomplete lines, but what are these *levissimi versus* he had dubbed *tibicines*? It has been suggested that these are stock lines repeated to sustain the flow of the hexameter, that is to say "provisional repetition".[7] But this does not square with the two examples Servius cites as *tibicines*, neither of which could be called a stock repetition.[8] While some stopgaps may have been repetitions, it seems more likely that they included all sorts of lines, and that their

[6] For the importance of variety see Cic. *De Or.* 2.177: *tractatio autem varia esse debet, ne aut cognoscat artem qui audiat, aut defetigetur similitudinis satietate.* Elsewhere Cicero (*De Or.* 3.192-93) advises variation even in the case of clausulae to avoid the *fastidium similitudinis*. Cf. *Rhet. Her.* 4.12.18, and warnings against excess in *Rhet. Her.* 4.23.32, 4.31.42; *De Or.* 3.97-103; Quint. *Inst.* 5.14.30, 8.3.52. But rhetoricians were also aware of the pleasing effects that could be produced by repetitive figures of speech: *eiusmodi autem studia ad delectationem ... accommodatiora ... est in his lepos et festivitas* (*Rhet. Her.* 4.23.32), or by the repetition of words: *non inopia verborum fit, ut ad idem verbum redeatur saepius; sed inest festivitas, quae facilius auribus diiudicari quam verbis demonstrari potest* (*Rhet. Her.* 4.14.21). Similarly Cic. *De Or.* 3.206: *nam et geminatio verborum habet interdum vim, leporem alias.*

[7] See Sparrow (1931: 10, 19).

[8] Cf. Servius on 6.186 FORTE PRECATUR—*vacat 'forte': et est versus de his qui tibicines vocantur, quibus datur aliquid ad solam metri sustentationem, ut* (5.457) *'nunc dextra nunc ille sinistra'*. And on 5.457 NUNC ILLE SINISTRA—*'ille' vacat: nam metri causa additum est.*

distinguishing characteristics were not repetition, but rather superfluity, redundancy, and lack of substance (*levissimi!*). The view that *tibicines* are provisional repetitions rests on the assumption that the process of composition necessarily passes through a repetitive stage before the work is trimmed down and polished to its final form. Hence the many repetitions in the *Aeneid* have been taken as evidence for its lack of revision. This need not be so. The vice of repetition does not corrupt every posthumous work, for although there is the example of Lucretius who revels in repetition, the *Argonautica* of Valerius Flaccus, also unfinished and published posthumously, is for all its other vices quite untouched by this one.

The existence of interpolated editions of the *Aeneid* at an early date is attested by Donatus and others.[9] To what extent these may have corrupted the text is open to debate, although the relative uniformity of the manuscript tradition suggests that their influence was minimal. Furthermore, the fact that the best manuscripts all omit both the spurious first four lines of the *Aeneid* and the Helen episode may also indicate that interpolations have been held in check, and that our text essentially goes back to the edition of Varius. The credit for saving the poet from wholesale corruption is normally given to Probus, who is believed to have edited a critical text of Vergil.[10]

A much greater source of corruption seems to have been scribal error, for in their ignorance scribes would incorporate glosses into the text, or

[9] *Vita Don.* 41: *edidit ... Varius, sed summatim emendata, ut qui versus etiam imperfectos sicut erant reliquerit; quos multi mox supplere conati non perinde valuerunt ob difficultatem, quod omnia fere apud eum hemistichia absoluto perfectoque sunt sensu.* Servius on 3.340 mentions that in 8.41 the hemistich *concessere deum* had been completed with *profugis nova moenia Teucris.* In Seneca's text apparently *piger ipse sibi obstat* had been added to *audentis Fortuna iuvat* in 10.284.

[10] This was the view of Leo (1912: 43). Sabbadini in his 1930 Vergil edition (vol. I, p. vi) found no evidence for such a critical text, arguing that Probus' activity was most likely confined to interpretation, because very few of the *lectiones Probianae* cited by Servius and other extant commentaries are found in the manuscripts. But since Servius frequently does not acknowledge his sources and may not have consulted Probus directly, it is not possible to use his testimony to form a reliable estimate of the impact of Probus' recension on our text. R. Hanslik in 1955 (*RE* 2nd ser., XV, 199-202) reaffirmed Leo's view that Probus' critical activity played a crucial role in the transmission of the Vergil text and he explained the paucity of readings attributed to Probus as follows: "...Probus hat den Text nicht gemäss seiner Recensio neu geschrieben, sondern in den Text nur die notae gesetzt, seine Verbesserungen aber in die adnotationes verwiesen, wie aus Serv. auct. Aen. I 21 klar hervorgeht: *in Probi adpuncti sunt* (d.h. im Text) *et adnotatum* (in den Anmerkungen)" (c. 201). Probus' competence as a textual critic is well attested by a number of correct readings which we owe to him alone, and he is said to have consulted a MS of the *Georgics* corrected by Vergil himself to settle questions of orthography (Gell. *N.A.* 13.21.4). In view of this and the high praise accorded him by Suetonius (*Ill. Gramm.* 24) and Jerome, who at A.D. 56 calls him *eruditissimus grammaticorum Romae*, it would seem that Probus, if anyone, should be credited with preserving the relative integrity of our text.

else, knowing their Vergil too well, would carelessly write what they remembered rather than what they saw. Some repetitions have obviously crept in this way, but careful examination of the manuscripts has generally helped to ferret them out. Here, as with interpolations, one must proceed with caution when a suspect repetition is supported by all or some of the best manuscripts. The internal evidence usually marshalled against such lines is frequently based on the assumption that interpolations are not well integrated into the fabric of the poem. Inverted, this often comes to mean that anything contradictory, inconsistent, and incomprehensible is open to suspicion on the ground that the poet would not have allowed incongruities to creep into his poem. Such reasoning presupposes a logical consistency alien to the creative process and is especially dangerous in a work such as the *Aeneid* which, lacking final revision, offers the critic a large area between the poet's inconsistencies and the later interpolations to be manipulated in accordance with his own taste and ingenuity. One marvels at the confidence with which some editors thought they could unfrock interpolations,[11] particularly since up to the latter part of the nineteenth century no one had undertaken a comprehensive study of repetitions in the *Aeneid*, so as to find out what Vergil's usage may have been. It was to fill this gap that in 1881 Albrecht published his lengthy article in *Hermes*.

Albrecht's main contribution was his list of repetitions (pp. 433-44), which formed a useful though ill-organized nucleus for further study, and by the sheer number of examples showed that interpolation alone would not suffice to explain the repetitions in the *Aeneid*. His objectives, however, were limited and his reaction against contemporary trends cautious and restrained.

Albrecht is most effective in defending the authenticity of specific repetitions, but in so doing he uses essentially the same methods and criteria for determining priority as did the interpolationists. He attacks excesses, not the methods themselves. His general observations are not particularly new or valuable. After examining a number of 'formulaic' repetitions he concludes that in describing similar events Vergil tended to avoid the repetition of a verse as little as Homer (p. 396), even though shortly before (p. 395) he had admitted that Vergil sometimes introduces 'unnecessary'

[11] E.g. Ribbeck, following Peerlkamp, condemns 4.126 *conubio iungam stabili propriamque dicabo* (= 1.73) as an interpolation, even though both *M* and *R* have the line (*P* has a lacuna from 116 to 162) and though it is further attested by Servius and Servius D. Ribbeck's zeal in tracking down interpolations has been criticized by many scholars, e.g. Conington on 12.461 and vol. II, p. x.

changes so as to avoid verbatim repetition of a line. In view of such inconsistency and his indiscriminate lumping together of various kinds of repetitions as 'formulae', he is rightly criticized by Sparrow for not being "clear in his mind what was meant by Homeric repetition".[12]

The article of Albrecht reflected a movement in Vergilian scholarship toward accepting our text as basically sound. Already Conington in his commentary (1st ed. 1863-71) was critical of the interpolationists and rejected far fewer lines than Ribbeck. Subsequent editions by Hirtzel (1902), Sabbadini (1930), Mynors (1969), and Geymonat (1973) have continued this conservative trend, condemning mainly those lines that are lacking in the best manuscripts.[13] The analytic school, though it still dominated the Homeric controversy, had begun to lose its grip on Vergil, as scholars turned from examining his faults to defining the nature of his art and poetic technique. Heinze's *Virgils epische Technik* (1902) and Norden's commentary on *Aeneid* 6 (1903) provided the decisive impetus in this direction.

Thus the climate of opinion had completely changed when, forty years after the appearance of Albrecht's article, Gladow published his dissertation on Vergilian repetition (1921). The need to defend repeated lines against the charge of interpolation no longer existed, and Gladow seems to have accepted most of them as genuine. Instead he set himself the task of determining a *ratio imitandi* in the hope of applying the results to the problem of authorship in the *Appendix Vergiliana*.

Gladow's comments are brief, more descriptive than analytical, and for the most part devoted to the problem of priority. This is a fairly important, but tricky (and often unprofitable) question, and one that is further complicated by Vergil's rather haphazard method of composition (*nihil ad ordinem*). With the exception of lines clearly written first and imitated later, the reconstructed order of composition can only be speculative.[14] In his explanation of *variatio* Gladow does not get much beyond the obvious reasons, such as metrical requirements, changes in tone, the necessary compression or expansion of the narrative, and the adaptation of a verse to

[12] Sparrow (1931: 59).

[13] Ribbeck condemns 27 repeated lines in the *Aeneid*, Conington 11, Hirtzel 14, Sabbadini 12, Mynors 13, Geymonat 12.

[14] In the *Aeneid* there are a few examples where priority seems to be rather obvious: e.g. 1.100-101 > 8.538-39, 1.124 > 4.160, 2.9 > 3.495, 3.343 > 12.440, 3.459 > 6.892, 4.263-64 > 11.74-75. Yet even here certainty is impossible. In most of these cases the repetition appears to be deliberate and designed to recall the previous passage, but this does not necessarily mean that the latter was written first. There is always the possibility that Vergil may have reworked both passages and deliberately inserted the repetition to help link them.

other persons or things. He observes that descriptive passages in the *Georgics* recur as similes in the *Aeneid* (pp. 27-28), that occasionally two verses combine to make one, and that Vergil avoids exact repetition of a verse in the same book (pp. 51-52).

The problem of authorship in the *Appendix Vergiliana* Gladow approaches in two ways: by examining the priority of verses occurring both there and in the *opera maiora*, and by comparing the nature of Vergil's repetitions with those in the *Appendix*. He finds the *Culex* Vergilian (pp. 64-70), the *Ciris* not (pp. 71-87).[15] His examination of the shorter poems is inconclusive, except for the *Copa*, which he also assigns to Vergil.[16] Unfortunately Gladow's methods often are not equal to their task. None of the repetitions he cites to support his notion of a *ratio imitandi* are exclusively Vergilian.[17] And the question of priority had already exercised many, including F. Skutsch and Leo, who brought to it much more ingenuity and critical acumen, yet reached opposite conclusions. It is a tricky business. The criteria generally followed to determine priority in the case of parallel

[15] In attributing the *Culex* to Vergil Gladow followed the testimony of the ancients and what was becoming the scholarly fashion of his time, which peaked within a decade. Some have continued to champion the poem's authenticity, e.g. Rostagni (1933: 73-97) and Duckworth (1969: 81-83), but a great majority have regarded it post-Vergilian, e.g. Klotz (1926), Jachmann (1928), Löfstedt (1949), Fraenkel (1952), Büchner (1955: 1099-1108), Ross (1975: 235-63), and Güntzschel (1972) with exhaustive bibliography.

Gladow considered the *Ciris* post-Vergilian, though for reasons that are often questionable. But he was on safe ground, for few of his contemporaries believed that it was genuine, while the work of Rand (1919: 145-155), Frank (1920: 35-46), and Rostagni (1933: 184-280) had yet to make its impact. In the controversy between F. Skutsch (1901, 1906) and Leo (1902, 1907) scholarly opinion eventually sided with the latter, namely that the author of the *Ciris* was not Gallus, but a retarded neoteric whose date was progressively pushed further into the Empire. Leo (1902: 62) assigned the poem to 18 B.C., Radford (1920: 160-71) thought it an early work of Ovid, Klotz (1922) and Helm (1937) suggested that it could be post-Ovidian, Büchner (1955: 1118-29) disagreed reluctantly. Most recently Lyne (1971) argued for a post-Statian date, and in his commentary (1978: 56) even entertained the third century A.D. as a possibility. M. L. Clarke (1973), prompted by Lyne's article, even thought that internal evidence yielded a specific date of composition—139 A.D.

For a fuller discussion of recent scholarship on the *Appendix* see Westendorp Boerma (1971) and C. Conti, 'Rassegna di studi sull' *Appendix Vergiliana*,' *Boll. di Studi Latini* 3 (1973) 351-92 and 4 (1974) 229-63.

[16] Gladow's evidence (pp. 60-61) does not warrant this, although the *Copa* has been defended as genuine by others, e.g. Drabkin (1930). It has generally been considered post-Vergilian, except by Büchner (1955: 1157-63), who dates it before Vergil, a view decisively rejected by Westendorp Boerma (1958).

[17] Knecht (1963: 506-512) has shown that the parallels with the *Ciris* differ little from Vergil's self-repetitions and thus constitute no evidence against authenticity. He also argues plausibly against the priority of the *Ciris*, because Vergil's imitations of his predecessors never extend to a full verse (see pp. 491-506), whereas the *Ciris* has three hexameters, two couplets, and one four-line passage in common with Vergil's greater works.

passages provide only tentative guidelines, because poets rarely heed the logic of philologists.[18]

These difficulties did not deter Mylius in 1946 from trying to decide on the basis of parallel passages if the Fourth *Georgic* had been revised after the fall of Gallus, as Servius claims. In the first part of her dissertation (pp. 1-69) she examines repetitions in the *Aeneid* for priority using the same criteria whose reliability has already been questioned above. She admits in about one-fifth of the cases that it is impossible to say which line was written first; the rest she arranges with varying success. The list of repetitions on which her conclusions are based is far from comprehensive (only half as long as Albrecht's or Gladow's), and although she discusses most repetitions of complete or nearly complete verses, she omits many that extend to four or five feet. Such omission is arbitrary and unfortunate, because variations are more likely to reveal something about the poet's

[18] The fundamental assumption underlying such criteria is that the imitation is less well integrated into its context than the original. It had been stated by R. M. Meyer (1906: 376) in an article that dealt with the larger problem of how similar phenomena arise in myth, culture, language, and literature: "das Übertragene steht innerhalb des Zusammenhangs nicht so organisch wie das dort Gewachsene.... Übertragung liegt vor, wo die Einzelerscheinung sich aus dem Zusammenhang lösen lässt, ohne ihn wesentlich zu schädigen, und wo dennoch Zufall ausgeschlossen ist." This has later been echoed by Löfstedt (1949: 148): "an expression, a phrase, a thought, which in its original place is natural, clear and well-motivated, usually becomes somewhat peculiar, a trifle hazy or less suitable in the context, when borrowed or imitated by another author, especially if this author is not a very great artist." And more recently by Westendorp Boerma (1971: 391-92): "Souvent on peut démontrer avec certitude que de tels passages de l'*Appendix* sont inspirés du Virgile authentique, simplement parce qu'ils ne cadrent pas directement avec le contexte de l'*Appendix*." There are instances where this appears to be the case, but appearances can be deceptive, as Meyer (1906: 384) and Hartman (1921) recognized. Bickel (1950: 298-303) cautioned that similarity need not imply imitation, and that an imitation may surpass the original and appear better adapted to its context, so that the confidence of Meyer and Löfstedt in being able to discern the patchwork of an imitator would seem to be excessive (p. 303). Much Latin poetry has perished, so that we cannot eliminate the possibility that the parallel passages are both drawing on a common source. But more importantly, determining priority or authenticity on the basis of parallel passages involves criteria that may be plausible in themselves, but are subjective in their application. Judgments about unity and coherence of a thought, about precision in language, about appropriateness of a passage and its integration with the context depend on our own notions of these things and on our ability to comprehend the poetic logic of the work (see Vretska 1957: 316 n57). Our knowledge of a poet's artistic and stylistic principles is for the most part based only on our reading and interpretation of the poetry itself, which means that it is derived from subjective experience and thus also somewhat limits our capacity for objective judgment (see F. W. Lenz 1962: 294). Given the relative lack of controls over subjective tendencies, any predisposition about priority or authenticity is likely to distort the argument so as to arrive at the preferred result (see Vretska 1957: 306). It is therefore with good reason that Westendorp Boerma (1971: 393) insists that *all* the criteria should be used together.

technique than exact repetitions. Her failure to consider adequately why variations occur undermines the validity of her observation (p. 70) that Vergil avoids exact repetition as much as possible, because he often seems to change repeated lines slightly for no apparent reason. In her last chapter (pp. 84ff.) she discusses the priority of the lines shared by the *Aeneid* and the Aristaeus episode. She concludes that the latter is posterior. It is somewhat surprising to find her arguments reiterated in Büchner's *RE* article (1955: 1317-18) and in Richter's commentary (1957), when W. B. Anderson (1933) and Norden (1934) had already shown the absurdity of Servius' account and suggested how it may have arisen.[19] Questions of priority are difficult enough when they involve different poets, but when we are dealing with the same poet, particularly one as sensitive and meticulous as Vergil, they are insoluble, unless we are ready to believe that he stitched together second-hand verse like some hack without talent, taste, or even a simple workmanlike touch to disguise his seams.

While other scholars were mostly preoccupied with problems of priority and authorship, Sparrow in 1931 posed the really vital question about the purpose and effect of Vergilian repetition, but he concluded rather quickly that in most cases the purpose is not apparent and the effect generally bad. By considering repetitions together with half-lines, Sparrow betrays his underlying assumption that both are essentially hallmarks of incompleteness, and he devotes the rest of his book to proving just that. The discussion of half-lines leaves little room for disagreement,[20] but he is less

[19] See also Burck (1959: 229-31), Duckworth (1959), Klingner (1963: 193-239), Segal (1966: 307-25), Otis (1964: 408-413), Wilkinson (1969: 108-120), and Austin on 6.305ff. Otis challenged the validity of Büchner's arguments by showing that the same criteria for priority could be used to demonstrate how the verses from the Fourth *Georgic* are more expanded, developed, and intensified in *Aeneid* 1 and 6, and therefore secondary. A few observations may be added to the points raised by Otis. He sees the Phorkys harbor in *Od.* 13.96-104 as the model for both 1.161 and *G* 4.420, yet Vergil clearly had a much closer parallel for the *Georgic* passage in the Proteus-Menelaus episode described in *Od.* 4.351-572, where there is also a *harbor* (358-69) and a *cave* (403). With regard to the correspondence between the reception of Aristaeus (*G* 4.376-79) and Dido's banquet for Aeneas (1.701-706), it should again be pointed out that they are modeled on different Homeric passages. The *Aeneid* scene follows largely the banquet of Alcinoos in *Od.* 7, while in the *Georgics* Vergil probably had Telemachus' meal with Menelaus in mind (*Od.* 4.52-8), the Homeric lines being identical in each case. Furthermore, the imitation of the Alcinoos banquet in *Aeneid* 1 also accounts for the 50 servants at Dido's feast.

[20] The burden of proof rests with those wishing to defend the half-lines as intentional—a pretty hopeless undertaking, since to our knowledge no poet before or after Vergil has ever intentionally written an incomplete hexameter. A plausible explanation is that Vergil composed not line by line but in paragraphs, so that the end of his sentence did not usually coincide with the end of the verse. Enjambement is more frequent in Vergil than in his predecessors (see C. Lenz 1937: 14 n17; Büchner 1936: 66-87; Worstbrock 1963: 126-30, 155-59). The effectiveness of some of the half-lines made it all the more difficult to finish

convincing when dealing with repetitions. Because he cannot reconcile the many repetitions which have "no apparent artistic effect" (p. 55) with what is known about Vergil's scrupulousness in revising his work, he suggests that in the *Aeneid* Vergil may have used repetition 'provisionally' as a kind of *tibicen*, which would have been removed or changed in the course of revision.

Sparrow points out that Vergil was prone to repeat himself, that similar ideas tended to suggest similar words and rhythms (p. 63).[21] He illustrates this through examples of words repeated after short intervals (pp. 60-61) and phrases taken 'unconsciously' from diverse books or contexts (pp. 61-64). His list, however, includes repetitions so striking that Vergil must have been conscious of them. Instances of 'effective' repetition are confined to fairly obvious categories, such as anaphora, refrains, and prophecies, which makes that list exceedingly brief. This of course supports his view that most repetitions are unconscious, temporary, or inevitable, but it also leads one to suspect that he did not seriously entertain the possibility of intentional or artistic repetition. The notion that Vergil may have used repetition in a new way, "as it is by such a sophisticated poet as Tennyson in his *Idylls*—so often and at such points that it acquires an artistic effect of its own" (p. 110), is raised only to be quickly rejected.

Sparrow's treatment of the material is marred by exaggerations and hasty conclusions. He asserts that "self-repetition is practically non-existent" in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* (p. 79), yet even the few examples he cites (pp. 72-73) show this to be inaccurate.[22] His conclusion that the apparent scarcity of repetition in those two poems constitutes a stylistic canon applicable to the *Aeneid* assumes that the three works, which draw on different generic and literary traditions, would use repetitions for the same purpose.

In dealing with the *Aeneid* Sparrow asks the important question about the relationship between Homeric and Vergilian repetition, but the way he formulates it precludes a useful answer. The repetitions in the *Aeneid* have generally been regarded as imitations of Homeric practice; Sparrow

them. For a general discussion see Shipley (1924); Walter (1933); F. W. Lenz (1971); also Pease on 4.44; Austin on 1.534, 2.66, 4.44, 6.94; Fordyce on 7.129; Eden on 8.41. For a defense of the half-lines see Belling (1899: 113-61), Conway on 1.534.

[21] On subconscious verbal association in Vergil, particularly the preoccupation with certain phonemic-semantic patterns (e.g. the series *sono*, *sonitus*, etc.) see the interesting, though needlessly elaborate, study of Roiron (1908).

[22] Sparrow also omits a number of repetitions in the *Eclogues*: 1.2 ~ 6.7, 1.46 ~ 51, 2.1 ~ 5.86, 3.1 ~ 5.87, 3.43 = 47, 3.104 ~ 106, 4.58 ~ 59, 4.60 ~ 62, 7.62 ~ 64, 7.65 ~ 68, 8.1 ~ 5, 10.37 ~ 41.

suggests "that Virgil, so far from imitating, actually did his best to avoid, Homeric repetition" (p. 87). By defining 'epic repetition' in very narrow terms—"epic repetition is one of the marks of the unpolished style in which the Homeric poems were composed..."; "it is just such a feature as we should expect Virgil not to imitate" (p. 88)—he had in effect eliminated any other conclusion except the one supporting his theory. Oral and literate poets may indeed use verbal repetition in different ways, but while Vergil seems to avoid Homeric repetition in its very narrow formulaic sense, it does not follow that he wished to avoid it altogether.[23]

[23] The difference between literary and oral epic language is an issue that still merits further study. Sparrow was apparently unaware of Milman Parry's work, but he felt that the sheer number of formulae employed by Homer set his style apart from Vergil's. Since Parry seemed to have demonstrated the purely utilitarian function of the formula, their quantity came to be used by some scholars (e.g. J. A. Notopoulos) as a test of orality.

Lord (1960: 130) was able to write: "Formula analysis...is able to indicate whether any given text is oral or 'literary'. An *oral* text will yield a predominance of clearly demonstrable formulas."

Kirk (1966) cautioned that formular *quantity* may not necessarily imply oral composition, citing the importance of such matters as "deployment, adaptation, and articulation of formulas" which he termed "formular *quality*" (p. 164). But these are, as Kirk himself admitted, rather subjective criteria, which do not help us much in our dilemma. The qualitative distinction between oral and literary epic is also maintained by Hainsworth (1968: 9): "The difference between Homer and his classical successors is one of *kind*. Neither Apollonius nor Virgil shows any economy or extension in their limited collection of formulae. Their choice of words is made on entirely different principles."

Yet the formulaic flexibility he examines reveals phenomena that are not radically different from those observable in written poetry. Similarly, the appropriateness and literary effectiveness of the Homeric epithets noticed by Whallon (1961, 1966, 1969) has suggested that the bard's poetic technique might be less mechanical and more self-conscious than has commonly been assumed. The most radical stand on the function of Homeric formulae has been taken by Dimock (1963: 44): "If the poet thinks in verse we can no longer maintain that it is the circumstances of composition...that force him to be repetitious."

Dimock finds that the compositional technique of the literate poet differs from that of the oral bard only in *degree*, for like the bard he works with analogy-formations, and "his language has been created by tradition and handed to him just as the oral poet's has, but it is a more flexible language" (p. 47).

More recently N. Austin (1975: 11-80) has also challenged the orthodox position by emphasizing how contextual forces govern the choice of formulas, often in violation of Parry's laws of consistency, regularity, and economy (see pp. 24-25, 39). Austin further suggested that the circumstances under which the Homeric epics were recorded may have produced compositions much less extemporaneous than Parry had envisioned and hence closer in style to literary epic than to oral song (see pp. 22-23). At about the same time Nagler (1974) shifted the emphasis from the formulae to the mental processes which produce them, the "deep structure" or Gestalt "which is retained in his [the poet's] unconscious mind probably in the same unknown way that the phrasal impulses of any natural language are retained in the mind between their realizations" (p. 19).

At this 'generative' level it becomes difficult to distinguish between oral and literary composition. Finally, Goold (1977) has now challenged the validity of Parry's hypothesis that Homer was an oral poet. For a different critique of Parry see Pope (1963).

Inadequate consideration of the evidence and tendentious argumentation lead Sparrow to conclude that most repetitions in the *Aeneid* are stopgaps, i.e. *tibicines*. Some objections to this have already been raised (see above, pp. 6-7). While at times Vergil may have repeated himself to sustain the flow of inspiration, the comments of Servius and Donatus suggest that the *tibicines* included all manner of props, such as an otiose word inserted to complete the meter, transitional verses between scenes, or brief sketches of passages to be worked out in detail later.[24] Donatus' description of how Vergil composed the *Aeneid* should be supplemented by the other remarks on his work habits (cf. Don. *Vita* 22). Apparently Vergil would compose the first draft of a passage in a sustained fury of composition, and then, just as with the *Georgics*, he would turn to revision. He must have revised continuously and concurrently, so that what we have is not likely to contain many remnants of such a draft. Whatever *imperfecta* and *tibicines* there may be, they cannot be identified as readily as Sparrow would like.[25]

Thus with the help of a long list of supposedly ineffective, provisional, or interpolated repetitions Sparrow suggests that the *Aeneid* was still in need of much revision at the time of Vergil's death. The inevitable speculation about the nature of such revision is potentially even more dangerous than the mindless acceptance of all that the MSS have handed down. It runs the risk of refashioning the poem after one's own standards, and that would be a return to the kind of criticism which had already run its course in the nineteenth century.

Although Sparrow's conclusions have often been accepted in subsequent commentaries on Vergil,[26] some scholars have continued to believe

[24] See Büchner (1955: 1426), Otis (1964: 417).

[25] To cast further doubt on the repetitions in the *Aeneid* Sparrow attaches a lengthy section (pp. 111-154) where he tries to show how scribal error and interpolation may have increased the number of repetitions in our text. In most cases, however, the cumulative weight of the best MSS suffices to preserve the correct reading. Sparrow's observations tend to illustrate scribal confusion without seriously challenging the established text.

[26] Pease cites Sparrow frequently and sometimes disagrees with him (cf. on 4.126, 285-86, 390, 402, 412, 418). Austin accepts Sparrow's conclusion that 'epic repetition' is rare in Vergil (e.g. on 4.7 and 280) and that some repetitions may be stopgaps (e.g. on 1.530-33 = 3.363-66). R. D. Williams (on 3.363-66) also believes that one of the repeated passages would have been changed. He seems to be in general quite thoroughly convinced by Sparrow's conclusions that "repetition in the Homeric manner" is very rare, that "in nearly all instances" the repetitions are stopgaps, which would have been removed during revision, and that the relative paucity of repetition in the *Georgics* is reason enough to suspect the repetitions in the *Aeneid* (see on 5.8-11). Austin, on the other hand, tends to be more critical (cf. on 2.775, 6.900f.). Other recent commentaries pay relatively little attention to Sparrow. Eden (1975) has only a few references (e.g. on 8.20f., where he disagrees); Fordyce (1977) mentions Sparrow only in connection with half-lines (on 7.129); Gransden (1976) ignores him altogether.

that repetition was an integral part of Vergil's style. Thus in 1931, the very year Sparrow's book was published, there appeared an article by Marouzeau showing how the repetition of lines, phrases, and words is a characteristic of Vergilian art.[27] A decade later Knight expressed similar views in his *Roman Vergil* and several articles.[28] The whole question of word repetition in Vergil was then studied at length in 1953 by Newton.[29]

Newton rejects Sparrow's assumption that repetition in Vergil is due to carelessness or lack of revision, "insomuch as the repetitions most frequently serve some discoverable purpose" (p. 9). This purpose he demonstrates through a detailed analysis of numerous passages containing repeated words. He believes that such repetition "forms a part of Vergil's artistic technique" (p. 410), and that it functions in various ways to round out or frame paragraphs, to relate statements or scenes, to emphasize, echo, pair, or contrast significant elements, and to connect similes with the actions they describe (p. 414). The results of Newton's study are significant for the present examination of repeated lines, for presumably Vergil could have used them in the larger structures of the poem for effects analogous to those produced by word repetition in paragraphs and short scenes.[30]

---

[27] See esp. his conclusion on p. 257: "Mais ce qui est caractéristique chez Virgile, c'est la fréquence extraordinaire du phénomène et la diversité de ses aspects. Nulle part peut-être dans la littérature latine on ne trouverait à ce degré la répétition soit recherchée, soit subie par l'effet d'une prédisposition et comme d'une hantise. Il y a là un des traits les plus caractéristiques et de la psychologie de Virgile."

[28] See Knight (1944b: 250, 269, 288-89), (1941: 212-25), (1944a: 10-14). Knight finds Vergil's repetitive tendency manifesting itself on the metrical and thematic as well as on the verbal level. He makes the important observation about stylistic differences between the *Eclogues*, *Georgics*, and *Aeneid* (1941: 221), but then, possibly under the influence of Sparrow, he fails to draw the obvious conclusion about the style of the *Aeneid*. Instead he suggests that if Vergil had lived to revise it, he probably "would have refined it down, till it became more like the *Georgics*" (p. 223).

[29] Newton was interested primarily in the artistic effect of word repetition. On unconscious word repetition see Austin on 1.85, 2.505, 4.409, 6.685; and R. D. Williams on 3.202, 5.72, 5.254. Austin sees iteration of words after a short interval as part of Vergil's style; Williams prefers to think that the repetitions would have been removed in revision. See also Fordyce on 7.491, 8.271f.; A. E. Housman, *Lucanus* (Cambridge, 1926), p. xxxiii; Marouzeau (1946: 261ff.).

[30] The dissertation of W. W. Briggs, Jr., "Repetitions from Virgil's 'Georgics' in the 'Aeneid'," (U.N.C., Chapel Hill, 1974) arrived when my manuscript was already finished, so that it was not possible to take account of it in the chapters that follow. It contains much interesting material, particularly on the sources of Vergilian formulae, the use of epic material in the *Georgics*, and the imitation of the latter in the *Aeneid*. Since Briggs does not deal with internal repetition, there is little overlap with my work, though his conclusions about the function of external repetitions seem to be generally compatible with what I have observed about repetitions in the *Aeneid*.

A few years earlier Pöschl in *Die Dichtkunst Virgils* (1950, 3rd ed. 1977) and Knox in an important article on *Aeneid* 2 (1950) had already begun to shift the emphasis away from narrow stylistic considerations to the poetic qualities of the *Aeneid*. They revealed that repetitions of various kinds expressed and unified the poem's thematic and imagistic content. There followed a spate of articles, some fanciful, but many showing convincingly how repetitions served an artistic purpose, so that these came to be fully recognized as legitimate poetic devices.[31] In view of this, and the publication of Knauer's important study (1964), which has significantly furthered our understanding of Vergil's relationship to Homer, it has seemed appropriate to reopen the question once posed by Sparrow about the nature of Vergilian repetition.

It should be stated at the outset that this is not a book about the mechanics or the psychology of repetition, although these topics are not entirely excluded. Such problems merit studies of their own. Nor are we concerned with questions of priority and chronology. The main interest lies not with fortuitous, unconscious, or 'inevitable' repetitions, but with those that may involve some awareness and conscious intent on the part of the poet. In other words, the emphasis is not on the process of repetition but on function and effect, not on method of composition but on poetic technique. But before we can talk about this, we must first show that the repetitions in the *Aeneid* were meant to be part of the poem's fabric. Sparrow's hypothesis that they are temporary props can neither be conclusively proved nor entirely refuted. We can merely entertain probabilities. For this reason our approach takes two forms. The first examines the influence of the literary tradition, the demands of genre, and some aspects of Vergil's style so as to establish the likelihood that the repetitions in the *Aeneid* are for the most part deliberate. The other tries to determine to what extent repetitions serve an artistic purpose. Here the results can only be speculative. Function and effectiveness are matters of interpretation, and consequently some degree of subjectivity is inevitable. But that is true of most literary criticism. We can reconstruct poetic intent only on the basis of perceived effect.

The conclusions about the nature of Vergilian repetition will have to stand largely on their own merits. Comparative data about the other Latin authors are either lacking, inadequate, or not applicable to the kind of inquiry pursued here. What is needed goes beyond lists and statistics, because understanding how repetitions function calls for detailed analysis

---

[31] E.g. by Buchheit (1963), Otis (1964), Putnam (1965), Kraggerud (1968), Binder (1971).

and interpretation of the contexts within which they occur. Much of this still remains to be done, even in Lucretius, whose repetitions have received almost as much attention as those in the *Aeneid*.[32] In dealing with Vergil's predecessors I have often had to rely on my own observations, which were of necessity narrowly focused and limited in their application. I do not discuss how later epic poets, even those that emulated Vergil, have used repetition, because their practice can at best only supplement but not refute what is observed in the *Aeneid*. Using Lucan, Silius, Valerius, or Statius to guide our understanding of Vergil's poetic technique is as precarious as relying on Vergil to illumine Homer's. We cannot presuppose that the imitator had correctly and fully understood his model. And even if he had, the presence of similar phenomena suggests imitation, their absence only the lack of imitation.

For similar reasons I have concentrated primarily on the repetitions in the *Aeneid*. The *Georgics* sometimes echo the *Eclogues* and both poems resonate in the *Aeneid*, but although such repetitions are listed in my Appendix, their function and significance will only occasionally engage our attention. Albrecht (1881: 402) maintains that in antiquity it was not unusual for a poet to repeat lines from the works he had already published. One may see in this practice an analogue to the way composers like Bach or Mozart do not hesitate to reuse material they had composed earlier for different occasions. But whether in music or literature, such repetition or self-imitation occurs for a variety of reasons. Bach was under great pressure to keep providing music for numerous sacred and secular occasions, so that the very lack of time often left him no choice but to draw on his own compositions or to arrange works by other composers. Plautus, living from pen to mouth, was in a similar situation, and it is therefore not surprising to find him repeating lines and passages.[33] It probably never occurred to him that this work would be imitated by later poets and diligently studied by scholars who might take a dim view of such repetition. But when Mozart in the last scene of *Don Giovanni* has the musicians on stage play excerpts from operas popular at the time, including Figaro's aria *Non più andrai farfallone amoroso* from his own *Marriage of Figaro*, we are dealing with an entirely different case. The self-congratulatory gesture is in keeping with Don Giovanni's satisfaction with his own life, but the playing of

[32] Cf. C. Lenz (1937), Deutsch (1939), Friedländer (1941), Bailey (1947: I.144-65), F. M. Smith (1966), Ingalls (1971), Minyard (1978). We still lack a comprehensive evaluation of Vergil's debt to Lucretius; the lists compiled by Merrill (1918: 135-247) are only a beginning.

[33] A few examples are listed by Albrecht (1881: 402 n1).

this particular aria shortly before the arrival of the Commendatore also adds a note of foreboding to what proves to be the Don's last supper and suggests that his days of wine, women, and song—like Cherubino's—are rapidly and inexorably coming to an end.

One would expect some of Vergil's repetitions from the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics* to belong to this latter category. Being under no compulsion to publish or perish, he did not need to borrow and had time to lick his verses into shape carefully. Sometimes he may simply have liked a particular phrase and repeated it for that reason alone, but occasionally repetition appears to be carefully planned.

In Book 5, on the first day in Sicily, Aeneas crowned with myrtle (velat *materna tempora myrto*, 5.72) pours a libation at the tomb of Anchises. In the proem of the first book of the *Georgics* Octavian is described in similar terms (cingens *materna tempora myrto*, *G* 1.28) and hailed as a future god. Both are of course descendants of Venus, and hence *materna myrto* is appropriate and perhaps even necessary. Yet this is not the only time Vergil joins Aeneas and Augustus by means of repetition (cf. for example 3.12 = 8.679, 8.680 = 10.261), so that he may well have repeated this phrase from the *Georgics* to emphasize the link. Curiously enough, when just before the departure from Sicily Aeneas pours a libation to the gods of the sea, he wears an *olive* wreath (*ipse caput tonsae foliis* evinc*tus olivae*, 5.774), recalling the proem of the third book of the *Georgics*, where Vergil in gratitude for his poetic triumphs vows a temple to his patron god—Octavian, whom he will honor with athletic contests and sacrifices while crowned with an olive wreath (*ipse caput tonsae foliis* orna*tus olivae*, *G* 3.21).[34] The two ceremonial libations and the wreaths worn by Aeneas at the beginning and end frame the whole Sicilian episode, just as in the *Georgics* the wreaths of Augustus and Vergil emphasize the balance between the first proem, predicting the deification of Octavian, and the third, vowing a temple to the already deified Octavian.[35]

But why the olive wreath? In Vergil's case it may be the emblem of his new role as priest of the temple,[36] but the olive crown was also the traditional prize of Olympic victors. In a passage where the poet extols his literary achievement and revels in his triumph (cf. *victor*, *G* 3.9, 17) we cannot exclude the latter association.[37] He is priest because of his victory.

[34] I am indebted to Prof. G. N. Knauer for drawing my attention to these passages.

[35] For a good discussion of the proems and of the poet's claim to equality with his patron see Buchheit (1972: esp. 17-31, 77-82, 92-113, 183). For the first proem cf. also G. Williams (1968: 93-95).

[36] So Conington, cf. also 6.808; 7.418, 751.

[37] See Buchheit (1972: 31-44, 92-113, 148-59).

Such an interpretation may seem out of place in the Fifth *Aeneid*, for what victory can Aeneas be celebrating after having just lost four ships? Yet at the funeral games for Anchises at least two victors have been crowned with the olive (5.309, 494), which establishes a pattern and forces us to regard the olive wreath at the end as symbolizing more than just Aeneas' sacerdotal function as *pater familias* and leader of the expedition. Four ships were indeed lost in the fire and the old and infirm settled in Sicily, but the rest can now continue unhindered to Italy. The end, the attainment of the goal, is imminent.[38] It is a victory bought dearly, but a victory it is nonetheless, fulfilling the prophecy once given by Helenus: *sic denique VICTOR/ Trinacria finis Italos mittere relicta* (3.439-40). The olive crown of Aeneas thus looks ahead to the arrival in Italy, and hence to the beginning of Roman history proper. In turn, the proem of the Third *Georgic*, while honoring Octavian, looks back to the beginning, to Assaracus and Tros (*G* 3.35-36). The proem presents a subtle interplay between poet and subject matter, between the glory of his own achievement and Octavian's, though in the end the poet, whether victor or priest, owes his glory to that of Octavian, whose victories he is celebrating. The olive crown is his by the grace of his tutelary divinity. But both he and Octavian ultimately derive their glory from the initial victory of Aeneas which made it all possible, and that is what the repetitions in Book 5 may imply.

I have digressed to suggest how the repetitions from Vergil's published works may enrich the texture and meaning of his poem. It is an interesting and potentially fruitful line of inquiry, but it probably would not tell us more about Vergil's technique than would the repetitions within the *Aeneid*. The frequency of external repetition is not likely to yield useful information about the relationship between repetition and style. Nor would conclusions about the function of external repetition suffice to challenge the validity of what may be observed about internal repetition. Should we find repetition from the other poems for the most part meaningless, it would merely confirm the assumption that Vergil borrows freely from his own works, but have little bearing on his practice within a poem. On the other hand, should many of these repetitions serve a poetic design, they could corroborate similar conclusions about internal repetition, but they would be irrelevant, if internal repetition were found to be singularly lacking in artistic intent.

[38] Kraggerud (1968: 106-232) has shown that the athletic contests in honor of Anchises, and especially the boat race, are a shadowplay of the greater contest faced by Aeneas, namely the voyage to Italy, which is seen in terms of a race in which Sicily represents the last critical point, the *meta* that must be rounded before the goal can be reached.

CHAPTER TWO

REPETITION, GENRE, AND STYLE

It is well known that there are many more repetitions in the *Aeneid* than in the *Georgics* or *Eclogues*, but apparently no one has tried to relate this fact to a possible shift in Vergil's style, or to the different influences of the genres and literary models he followed. Of course, the variation in frequency might also be caused by other factors. Presumably in a long epic poem, where similar actions and situations often recur, repetitions would be more likely to arise than in didactic poetry or pastoral. This could indeed explain some of the differences among the genres, though not the difference among works in the same genre, such as the poems of Hesiod, Aratus, and Lucretius. While we must recognize that subject matter, as well as the limitations of language and meter, make some repetitions inevitable, they do not account for the great mass of repetitions found in the *Aeneid*. On the contrary, their frequency and general character suggest that they reflect those aspects over which the poet has some control, namely his own style and his attitude toward his predecessors in the various genres. These will be the principal concern of this chapter, but first some statistics for the frequency of repetition in the *Eclogues*, *Georgics*, and *Aeneid*, which will further show how inaccurate and misleading it is to assume the existence of a uniform Vergilian style.[1]

For the sake of convenience, style and poetic tradition are treated separately, even though they are very much interrelated, since style is the product of the poet's interaction with the tradition. The discussion of style makes no pretense to being comprehensive, but rather attempts to isolate a few elements which may have some bearing on the use or avoidance of repetition. To this end I shall examine the incidence of words and syllables repeated at verse beginning or end (*homoeokatarkton* or *homoeoteleuton*), for although it is not expected that such repetition will necessarily parallel the statistics for verse repetition, the study of repetition on a small scale may well yield insights applicable to longer repetitions. Next, to show the impact of genre on style, I shall remark on a few features of the bucolic style

[1] That does not preclude other kinds of unities in Vergil's work, such as the conceptual and ideological coherence observed in the three poems by Schadewaldt (1960: 498-519) and Klingner (1965: 274-92), or the capacity for empathetic narrative which Otis (1964: 41-96) calls the 'subjective style.'

which set the *Eclogues* apart from the other two poems. Finally, to gain a better understanding of Vergil's relationship to the epic tradition, I shall briefly compare his use of several formulaic expressions with the practice of Homer and Apollonius.

I. FREQUENCY OF REPETITION

Verbal repetitions can be classified by their *origin*, *function*, or *length*. In origin they may range from the fully conscious to the unconscious, and from the fortuitous to the inevitable, but it would be rather difficult and unprofitable to try to differentiate among the various categories. Classifying repetitions by function (e.g. formulaic, structural, rhetorical, etc.) may be easier, but it would exclude unconscious and accidental repetitions and rest on an essentially subjective determination of their role. The most useful and least subjective method of classification is by length, for it not only includes all types of repetition, but is also likely to reflect a degree of conscious intent, since we can expect some correlation between the length of a repetition and the poet's awareness of it.

The term 'repetition' as used hereafter will refer to verbal repetition extending from 2$^1/_2$ feet (five elements) to a whole verse (twelve elements). There are a number of repeated passages in the *Aeneid* ranging from two to four lines,[2] but since they are relatively few and brief compared to those found in Homer or even Lucretius, it has seemed best for statistical purposes to count the lines individually.[3] There is no need to illustrate the longer repetitions that range from five feet to a full hexameter, since they are easily identified. The main difficulties lie at the other end of the scale, for many of the shorter repetitions are borderline cases, and one must decide whether they qualify as repetitions or not. Here exact metrical correspondence between the repetitions is very important, for it indicates that one is dealing not with mere words recurring in similar contexts, but with verbal-metrical patterns, which the poet, consciously or not, has repeated. Since the re-arrangement of the same words in different metrical positions may imply that the poet wished to vary his line, it has been necessary to

[2] E.g. 1.530-33 = 3.163-66, 3.390-93 = 8.43-46 (though 8.46 is usually athetized), 2.792-94 = 6.700-702, 3.192-95 = 5.8-11, 4.285-86 = 8.20-21, 4.584-85 = 9.459-60, 9.104-106 = 10.113-115, 10.745-46 = 12.309-310.

[3] This is admittedly a compromise, because it does not allow for differentiation between lines that belong to repeated passages and those that are repeated individually. On the other hand, it seems inappropriate to count a repeated passage of four lines as one repetition and treat it as if it were the equivalent of much shorter repetitions. The advantage of the present method is that it reduces the relative difference in length between the repetitions.

restrict the degree of variation allowable in word order, meter, and continuity.

The methods and criteria which have been used to define repetitions are explained in the Appendix (see pp. 184-88). The purpose of these rules is to ensure that the statistics for frequency of repetition are based on known and relatively consistent quantities. The decision to set the lower limit at five elements was somewhat arbitrary and does not imply that whatever falls outside this limit is unimportant. It may, for example, be significant that both Dido and Cleopatra are described as pale at the approach of death (*pállida mórte futúra*, 4.644 = *pallḗntem mórte futúra*, 8.709),[4] even though the phrase does not qualify as a repetition. For this reason a number of shorter repetitions and imitations, which are excluded from the statistics, have been listed in the Appendix in parentheses. If the limit had been set lower, differentiation between phrase and word repetition would have become difficult, whereas a higher limit would have excluded very many examples. Furthermore, a repetition of five elements is quite common and makes a convenient metrical unit, for at the beginning of the verse it coincides with the penthemimeral caesura, while at the end it begins after the hephthemimeral caesura. To be sure, many five-element repetitions will involve noun-epithet combinations (*at pius Aeneas, Troius Aeneas, Saturnia Iuno, longaeva sacerdos*) and other expressions that might be called formulaic (*haec ubi dicta dedit, sic deinde locutus, ac talia fatur, talia voce refert*), but they will also include more important repetitions (e.g. *causa mali tanti*, 6.93 = 11.480; *fata viam invenient*, 3.395 = 10.113; *stans celsa in puppi*, 3.527 = 8.680 = 10.261). Obviously a repetition is not necessarily significant because it is long, but it is more likely that the poet was aware of it. At any rate, although significance may be a matter of interpretation, length and frequency can be objectively determined and may be of some help for understanding the stylistic sensibilities of the poet, or the requirements of the particular genre in which he is working.

In computing frequency each occurrence of a repeated line or phrase has been counted as *one* repetition, so that, for example, an expression like

[4] See Guillemin (1951: 265-67) and Eden on 8.709: "...this recollection is significant: in much of the description of Dido Virgil invites the reader to think of Cleopatra." But cf. Eden's more cautious statement on phrase repetition (on 8.28), stressing that usually there is no cross-reference, because many phrases are drawn from the hexameter tradition and are repeated naturally to describe similar things, "just as in the Homeric poems." The comparison with Homer may be inappropriate. Although little can be built on *sub aetheris axe* and the comparison with Wagnerian leitmotifs is too easily dimissed, repetition lends a phrase emotional intensity and makes it more memorable, qualities which a poet like Vergil could well have exploited.

Troiana iuventus, which occurs four times, counts as four repetitions. Furthermore, only internal repetition, that is repetition within the individual works themselves, has been included. The frequency statistics given below are based on Mynors' text and have been computed in several ways. First, the total number of lines in each work was divided by the total number of repetitions, with the following results:

REPETITION OF FIVE TO TWELVE ELEMENTS IN THE INDIVIDUAL WORKS

Eclogues (830):[5]	one repetition every	15.4 lines/ 6.5%
Georgics (2188):	one repetition every	37.7 lines/ 2.7%
Aeneid (9896):	one repetition every	5.5 lines/18.2%

As expected, the *Aeneid* shows the highest incidence of repetition, which may in part be attributed to its much greater length (12 times longer than the *Eclogues*, 4.5 times longer than the *Georgics*), although the difference between the latter two poems is not at all in proportion with their relative lengths. A comparison of repetition within the individual books, though probably more accurate than the above, would also be misleading. The average book of the *Aeneid* is about 825 lines long, almost exactly the total number of lines in the *Eclogues* (830), but 278 lines longer than the average book of the *Georgics*. To overcome this difficulty, six continuous segments from the *Georgics* averaging 823 lines each were selected, and the figures given below represent the mean of all six passages.[6] These compare with the *Eclogues* and the individual books of the *Aeneid* as follows:

REPETITION OF FIVE TO TWELVE ELEMENTS (EQUALIZED LENGTH)

Eclogues (830):	one repetition every	15.4 lines/ 6.5%
Georgics (823):	one repetition every	68.6 lines/ 1.5%
Aeneid (825):	one repetition every	28.0 lines/ 3.6%

[5] The refrains in *Eclogue* 8 are not counted as repetitions, for because of their special function they cannot really be equated to the other repetitions, and their inclusion would distort the statistics for the *Eclogues*. They are counted, however, as part of the total number of lines in the *Eclogues*. Included among the refrains is line 28a, introduced by Ribbeck and most later editors from Gud. to balance the refrain in 76. For an attractive argument against both refrains see Skutsch (1969).

[6] The figures for the six passages from the *Georgics* may be set forth as follows:

	lines	5-9 el.	freq.	10-12 el.	freq.	total 5-12	total freq.
G 1.1-2.258	773	4	193.3	2	386.5	6	128.8
G 1.259-2.542	798	6	133.0	4	199.5	10	79.8
G 2.1-3.294	836	12	69.7	—	—	12	69.7
G 2.259-3.566	850	14	60.7	—	—	14	60.7
G 3.1-4.280	846	14	60.4	—	—	14	60.4
G 3.295-4.566	838	12	69.8	4	209.5	16	52.4
Total (average length: *823.5*)	4941	62	79.7	10	494.0	72	68.6

The frequency of repetition in the *Aeneid* is here actually lower than in the *Eclogues*, although predictably it is lower still in the *Georgics*. The relative frequency of repetition within the three poems remains roughly the same even when the repetitions themselves are weighted[7] so as to reflect more accurately their various lengths:

REPETITION OF FIVE TO TWELVE ELEMENTS (EQUALIZED/WEIGHTED)

Eclogues (830):	one repetition every	12.4 lines/ 8.1%
Georgics (823):	one repetition every	59.5 lines/ 1.7%
Aeneid (825):	one repetition every	24.1 lines/ 4.2%

But the picture changes substantially if we try to compare the incidence of longer repetitions (10 to 12 elements):

REPETITION OF TEN TO TWELVE ELEMENTS (EQUALIZED LENGTH)

Eclogues (830):	one repetition every	138.2 lines/ .7%
Georgics (823):	one repetition every	494.0 lines/ .2%
Aeneid (825):	one repetition every	706.9 lines/ .1%

Contrary to what one might have expected, Vergil avoids longer repetitions within the individual books of the *Aeneid* much more than in comparable segments of the *Georgics* or the *Eclogues*, in fact much more than in the individual poems of the *Eclogues* (once every 207.3 lines). While there is a definite trend from the *Eclogues* to the *Aeneid* toward fewer long repetitions within the same book, shorter repetitions (5 to 9 elements), which are very common in the *Eclogues*, but scrupulously avoided in the *Georgics*, are in the *Aeneid* again employed with a frequency only slightly lower than that of the *Eclogues*:

REPETITION OF FIVE TO NINE ELEMENTS (EQUALIZED LENGTH)

Eclogues (830):	one repetition every	17.3 lines/ 5.8%
Georgics (823):	one repetition every	79.7 lines/ 1.3%
Aeneid (825):	one repetition every	29.2 lines/ 3.4%

Our statistics confirm the generally held view that repetitions are much more common in the *Aeneid* than in the *Georgics*, but this difference derives mainly from a much greater frequency of shorter repetitions in the *Aeneid*. There are, of course, many repeated lines, but very few of them are repeated in the same book. Many of the longer repetitions occurring in different books are separated by a thousand lines or more, and in such cases it does not seem likely that they would have been regarded as

[7] Repetitions of 5-6 elements are each counted as *one* repetition, while repetitions of 7-9 elements are multiplied by *1.5*, and repetitions of 10-12 elements by *2*.

offensive, even if they had no artistic function whatsoever. The very length of the *Aeneid* must have contributed no small number of repetitions, and it is therefore not possible to make a valid comparison of the frequencies of repetition without somehow neutralizing the effect of the poem's length on repetition. When that is done, the frequency of repetition, though still higher than in the *Georgics*, turns out to be less remarkable than the initial figures had indicated.

While the difference between the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid* is striking, we should also observe the difference between the *Georgics* and the *Eclogues*, especially in the number of shorter repetitions. Sparrow notes many of them (pp. 71-75), but he ignores the fact that these works are much shorter than the *Aeneid*, and concludes that "self-repetition within either *Eclogues* or *Georgics* is practically non-existent" (p. 79). The underlying assumption seems to be that these two poems represent a uniform Vergilian style against which the *Aeneid* can be measured (see Sparrow, p. 72). Nothing could be further from the truth, for as is shown by the frequency of repetition and by several other features to be examined in the sections that follow, the *Eclogues* are stylistically in a class by themselves. We are clearly dealing not with one uniform style, but with three different styles, and hence one cannot expect that conclusions reached on the basis of repetition in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* will have any validity for the *Aeneid*. To do so would be disregarding three obvious reasons why the style of the *Aeneid* might be different. First of all, we are faced with three different genres, all of which might conceivably have placed different demands on repetition. Second, imitation of different poetic models might have influenced the use of repetition. Finally, a poet's style tends to change and evolve. To expect that Vergil would have continued writing in the style of the *Georgics* is to deny him the possibility of further artistic development.

II. REPETITION AND STYLE

A. *Homoeokatarkton and Homoeoteleuton*

The frequency of repeated lines and phrases reflects a complex interaction of different factors. While one would assume that the psychological processes which cause the poet to repeat himself remain fairly constant, the particular stylistic sensitivity which in turn checks or exploits such repetition varies, depending on conscious awareness and artistic intent. The shorter the repetitions and the greater the distance separating them, the less likely they are to offend and be removed in the course of revision. But the converse is not necessarily true, for the longer repetitions, being

more conspicuous, may well derive from careful design rather than negligence. Because there is no objective way to distinguish the intentional from the fortuitous, the frequency statistics can only give a rough approximation of the stylistic principles involved.

In view of this it will be helpful to supplement our findings by looking at the incidence of repeated words and syllables within relatively short passages, where we could expect Vergil to have had greater control over specific details than in a whole book of the *Georgics* or the *Aeneid*. All forms of word repetition need not concern us here; it should suffice to examine only those repetitions occurring at the most emphatic points of the hexameter—the beginning and the end. The frequency of such *homoeokatarkton* and *homoeoteleuton* has been determined on the basis of ten-line passages—sufficiently brief for the poet to have been aware of the repetitions, yet long enough to allow for the repetition of words without an obviously rhetorical purpose.[8]

Rhetoric does play an important role, particularly in the case of *homoeokatarkton*, which often is used to define parallel sentence structure, stress particular ideas, or deepen pathos. Because of its greater rhetorical usefulness, and because the initial position is more emphatic than the final, *homoeokatarkton* is probably more carefully controlled than *homoeoteleuton*. The latter is less influenced by sentence structure or the need for rhetorical emphasis, and hence less subject to conscious manipulation. Syllabic *homoeoteleuton* (rime) is very likely to arise in any highly inflected language, but its frequency still depends on whether the poet avoids or exploits such jingles. It seems therefore that although *homoeokatarkton* and *homoeoteleuton* differ somewhat in origin and function, together they may give us an insight into Vergil's stylistic and aesthetic sensibilities, and that the trends observed in the use of small-scale repetition may provide a good point of reference to guide our examination of the longer repetitions.

---

[8] Frequency was not computed on the basis of individual repetitions, as in the case of repeated phrases and lines, but on the basis of pairs of repetitions, i.e. a word occurring twice within ten lines is counted as one 'repetition', a word occurring three times in succession (provided each instance is no more than ten lines from the next) is counted as two 'repetitions', and so on. On the assumption that the distance separating such repetions stands in an inverse relationship to conscious intent, I have adopted this procedure so as to be able to distinguish between repetitions within three lines and those occurring farther apart.

1. *Homoeokatarkton*[9]

The frequency of word repetition at the beginning of the hexameter decreases progressively from the *Eclogues* to the *Aeneid*:

WORD HOMOEOKATARKTA WITHIN TEN LINES

Eclogues:	once every	10.5 lines
Georgics:	once every	16.9 lines
Aeneid 1-6:	once every	26.9 lines

The higher incidence of such repetition in the *Eclogues* probably reflects a striving for symmetry which is characteristic of the bucolic genre, but is avoided in the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid* (see below, pp. 39-55). In particular, the use of anaphora to emphasize symmetrical sentence structure accounts in the *Eclogues* for a much higher concentration of words repeated within three lines than in the other two poems, where such repeated words are both less frequent and comprise a significantly lower percentage of all word repetitions, as can easily be seen in the following table:

WORD HOMOEOKATARKTA WITHIN THREE LINES

Eclogues:	once every	21.3 lines, 49.3%	of all words
Georgics:	once every	42.9 lines, 39.5%	of all words
Aeneid 1-6:	once every	79.3 lines, 33.9%	of all words

The difference between the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics* comes as no surprise, but it is interesting that the difference between the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid* is as great, if not greater. Evidently the kind of parallelism pursued in the *Eclogues* is avoided even more scrupulously in the *Aeneid* than in the *Georgics*. This trend to fewer word repetitions at verse beginning may be explained in several ways. The most obvious is to suppose that the subject matter offered varying opportunities for such repetition, except that our observations conflict with what might have been expected in such a case. Because of the rhetorical nature of many *homoeokatarkta* occurring within three lines, one would assume that they would be more frequent in an epic poem with its many speeches than in didactic poetry, but actually the

[9] The following examples of words repeated at verse beginning within ten lines of each other will illustrate the nature and range of such repetition: *nos* (*E* 1.3-4), *saepe* (*E* 1.8, 16), *nec* (*E* 1.32, 41), *hinc* (*E* 1.53, 56), *nec* (*E* 1.57-58), *et* (*E* 3.6, 9, 14-15, 19), *Phyllida* (*E* 3.76, 78), *cantantes* (*E* 9.64-65), *quique* (*G* 1.22-23), *urit—urunt* (*G* 1.77-78), *quid* (*G* 1.104, 111), *tum* (*G* 1.139, 143, 145), *et—ter—ter—et—aut—et—aut—et—et* (*G* 1.280, 281, 283, 285, 288, 291, 295, 296, 298), *quae—saepe—quae—saepe* (*G* 1.313, 316, 319, 322), *atque—quid—quid—atque* (*G* 3.257, 258, 264, 265), *et* (*A* 1.63, 66), *hic* (*A* 1.247, 253, 261), *nate* (*A* 1.664-65), *urbis—urbs* (*A* 2.360, 363), *apparet—apparent* (*A* 2.483-84), *da* (*A* 3.85, 89), *tum* (*A* 3.175, 182), *et* (*A* 3.263, 266, 273, 275), *haec* (*A* 4.189, 195), *Atlantis* (*A* 4.247-48), *quae* (*A* 4.479, 485), *Centaurus* (*A* 5.155, 157), *ille—multa—multa—ille* (*A* 5.430, 433-34, 439).

reverse is true. In fact, such repetitions are only slightly more common in the speeches (33 instances) than in the narrative (28) of *Aeneid* 1-6. Either different stylistic standards apply to the three genres, or the *Georgics*, because of their didactic purpose, rely more heavily on rhetorical devices than the *Aeneid*, or else the decrease reflects a gradual change in attitude toward repetition in general. But in any event, the disparity we have found should warn us that observations on the use and frequency of repetition in one work are not necessarily applicable to another.

Yet as the frequency of word repetition diminishes, there is a corresponding increase in syllabic *homoeokatarkton*:[10]

SYLLABIC HOMOEOKATARKTA WITHIN TEN LINES[11]

Eclogues:	once every	31.9 lines
Georgics:	once every	23.8 lines
Aeneid 1-6:	once every	18.3 lines

This development is further paralleled by a greater incidence of syllabic *homoeokatarkton* within three lines, although (as in the case of word repetition within the same span) it comprises a gradually decreasing percentage of all syllabic repetitions as we pass from the *Eclogues* to the *Aeneid*:

SYLLABIC HOMOEOKATARKTA WITHIN THREE LINES[11]

Eclogues:	once every	69.0 lines, 46.2%	of all syllables
Georgics:	once every	57.3 lines, 41.3%	of all syllables
Aeneid 1-6:	once every	51.7 lines, 35.4%	of all syllables

The relative scarcity of syllabic *homoeokatarkton* in the *Eclogues* could perhaps be attributed to the fact that repeated words were judged more effective in emphasizing the symmetry and parallelism of the bucolic genre, although the gradual increase in the *Georgics* and *Aeneid* may also suggest a change in Vergil's style.

The contrary trends observed in the repetition of words and syllables apply to some extent also to sequences, that is the frequent recurrence of the same initial word or syllable. Syllabic sequences are very rare in the *Eclogues*. There are some word sequences (e.g. *et* 5 times in *E* 3.6-19, *qui* 3 times in *E* 3.88-92, *tum* 3 times in *E* 6.61-64, *si* 4 times in *E* 7.31-43), but more often than not these seem to be determined by parallelism in sentence structure or amoebaean response. Word sequences are more

[10] Syllabic repetition includes both identical and similar syllables, e.g. *cŏr*pora/*cŏr*ripiunt, *in*spectura/*in*sonuere/*im*pulerat, *dăt*/*dā*, *ŏm*nia/*ō*mina, *prō*tinus/*prō*gredior. Although it might have been interesting to differentiate between these two types, it is unlikely that this would have substantially affected the general conclusions about syllabic *homoeokatarkton*.

[11] This excludes the syllabic parts of word *homoeokatarkta*.

common in the *Georgics* than in the *Aeneid*. Presumably in the *Georgics* there are more opportunities for such repetition, not only in the catalogues and descriptions, but especially in the didactic passages, where the repeated particles, conjunctions, and pronouns often help to clarify the various parts of the argument. Thus when Vergil relates the gradual development of the arts of civilization, he repeats *tum* three times in fairly short succession (*G* 1.139-145), and he repeats *et* eight times when he describes the different varieties of soil (*G* 2.189-223).[12] Similar examples also occur in the *Aeneid*, such as in 2.36-48, where *aut* is repeated five times in the debate over the Wooden Horse.[13] Generally, however, word sequences are rather unobtrusive in the *Aeneid*, because such word repetitions usually occur further apart and consist almost exclusively of *et*.[14]

On the other hand, syllabic sequences are much more widespread in the *Aeneid* than in the *Georgics*, where the same syllable rarely occurs more than three times in close succession (e.g. *in-* four times in *G* 2.45-52, *G* 2.332-49, *G* 3.37-41). In the *Aeneid* Vergil often makes very effective use of such sequences, as in the description of the storm: *im*pulit—*in*cubuere—*in*sequitur—*in*tonuere—*in*gemit (1.82-93). From the moment Aeolus strikes the mountainside these words rush forth like the winds from his cave, punctuating the storm like peals of thunder and culminating in the anguished groan of Aeneas.[15] Vergil manages to convey a similar sense of rapidity when he describes how Aeneas slays the seven stags: *con*stitit—*cor*ripuit—*corn*ibus—*cor*pora (1.187-193).[16] Syllabic repetition is particularly effective in depicting a swift succession of events, but it is not employed for that purpose alone. In the Celaeno episode syllabic echoes along with other repetitions help to emphasize the renewed attempts of the Trojans to finish their feast: IN*ruimus*—IN partem—ex*struimus*—IMmundo—*rursum*—IN*struimus*—*rursum* (3.222-232). Another emphatic sequence occurs when Laocoon hurls his spear against the Horse: *in*spectura—*in* latus *in*que—*in*sonuere—*im*pulerat (2.47-55). Finally, as the Horse is dragged to the citadel and the festivities give way to night and the treachery of

[12] Cf. also *G* 1.158-61 (*an* 3 times), *G* 2.388-95 (*et* 3 times), *G* 3.53-59 (*et* 3 times), *G* 3.409-416 (*saepe* 3 times), *G* 4.179-83 (*et* 3 times), *G* 4.289-93 (*et* 3 times).

[13] Sentence structure may again be a factor. The first two instances of *aut* (36 and 38) state the alternatives suggested by Capys, they are followed by the speech of Laocoon, where the medial *aut* (43) introduces his general concern, which leads to three concrete possibilities, each stressed by an initial *aut* (45, 46, 48).

[14] 3.263-75 (4 times), 3.459-91 (5 times), 3.539-58 (4 times), 4.610-14 (3 times), 5.354-59 (3 times).

[15] Note the regularity with which these initial syllables recur—82, 84, 87, 90, 93.

[16] Here the distance between *homoeokatarkta* increases with each occurrence—187, 188, 190, 193.

Sinon, compounds in *in-* recur with an almost clocklike regularity as if to mark the inexorable progression towards doom: *in*sinuat pavor—*in*tendunt—*in*stamus—*in*volvens—*in*clusos—*in*vadunt—*in*cipit—*in* somnis (2.229-270).[17] There are many other examples of such sequences.[18] Since most of these syllabic sequences are made up of words compounded with the preposition *in-*, one might object that they are of little significance, because such compounds are very common in Latin. But as the above examples may show, Vergil seems to have realized the potential effectiveness of such repetition.

At times one also finds different sequences interlaced with one another to create an elaborate pattern of sound. This is again more fully developed in the *Aeneid* than in the *Georgics*, where the repetition of words, especially adverbs and conjunctions, at verse beginning still predominates over the repetition of syllables (*Georgics*: once in 16.9 lines :: once in 23.8 lines; *Aeneid*: once in 26.9 lines :: once in 18.3 lines). Therefore, when such patterns do occur in the *Georgics*, they usually include a large number of repeated words:

G 1.133-154: UT—UT—TUNC—TUM—in—TUM—TUM—im—in—in

G 1.280-325: ET—TER—TER—ET—AUT—ET—in—AUT—ET—ET—in—ET
QUAE—SAEPE—QUAE—SAEPE—ET—ET

G 4.89-114: de—de—NAM—ET—de—NAM—ar—ar—ET—in—in—ET—
IPSE—IPSE

G 4.157-72: ex—na—ex—na—su—su—ac—ac

G 4.278-302: pa—pa—ex—ET—qua—ET—ET—ex—qua—tu—quae—tu

G 4.458-477: im—AT—im—ATque—TE—TE—in—AT—ma—ma—im

Consecutive pairs, however, represent the more usual pattern of *homoeokatarkton* in the *Georgics*:

G 1.37-49: NEC—NEC—in—in—ill—ill
G 1.73-83: AUT—AUT—URIT—URUNT—NE—NEC

[17] Many compounds in *in-* are also found in the middle of the verse—*in*torserit (231), *in*nuptaeque (238), *in*labitur (240), *in*cluta (241), *in* limine (242), *im*memores (244), *in*felix (245), *in*terea (250), *in*structis (254), *in*iquis (257), so that this series of syllabic *homoeokatarkta* may just be a function of the frequency of these compounds in the passage. Such frequency, however, is remarkable (18 in 42 lines) and suggests preoccupation with that sound.

[18] *In*ferret—*in*signem—*im*pulerit (1.6-11), *reg*inam—*reg*ius—*reg*ales (1.674-86), *in*sidat—*in*cipit—*in*censi—*im*plevit (1.719-29), *in*geminant—*in*felix—*in*sidias (1.747-54), *in* segetem—*in*cidit—*in*sidiae (2.304-310), *ex*cessere—*ex*egit—*ex*plicet (2.351-62), *illi*—*il*icet—*Il*iaci (2.420-431), *in*gens—*in*cumbens—*im*pulit (2.513-20), *in*census—*im*plevi—*in*felix (2.764-72), *con*ubiis—*cor*rupto—*cor*pora (3.136-41), *inde impediunt*—*in*fensi—*impediunt* (5.583-93).

G 1.387-96: ET—ET—ne—ne—NEC—NEC
G 2.497-508: AUT—AUT—in—in—HIC—HIC
G 2.523-40: INTERea—INTER—HANC—HANC—im—im

In the *Aeneid* the patterns are primarily syllabic and generally more complex. Consecutive pairs are not very common, for there is a tendency to make even the smaller patterns concentric or interlocking:

4.173-83: ext—mo—ext—mo—TOT—TOT
4.279-85: at—ar—ar—at—at
4.540-52: QUIS—in—QUID—in—QUIN—NON—NON
4.644-50: *in*ter—*in*ter—con—con—*in*
5.658-65: in—con—con—in
5.727-35: de—con—de—de—con—con
6.613-22: in—in—dis—in—dis—in

Only on rare occasions does a longer pattern consist of separate segments:

6.4-33: an—prae—prae—an—prae—in—re—re—in—co—co—
HIC—HIC—BIS—BIS

More often there is some unifying feature, such as in the following example, where the progression from *con-* to *Cen-* and *cum* provides the necessary continuity:[19]

5.136-67: con—in—cor—in—in—con—cor—con—cons—cons—
CENTAURUS—CENTAURUS—CUM—QUO—QUO—CUM

Some patterns may consist of elaborately interlocked pairs, but usually it is a pervasive sequence of repeated syllables which unifies the whole:

5.310-25: 310 PRIMUS—314 TERTIUS—e—318 PRIMUS—e—in—322 TERTIUS—in
3.676-84: exc—Ae—con—aë—con—exc—con
6.426-40: con—in—NEC—con—pro—in—pro—NEC
6.518-30: du—in—in—du—e—e—in—in
2.15-24: ins—HUC—in—in—ins—HUC
2.330-63: in—ob—op—IN—ET—ET—in—in—ex—in—ex—URBIS—ex—UR

[19] The sequence of events is further structured through TUM (132), INDE (139), TUM (148), IAMQUE (159), CUM (160), TUM (172).

3.134-44: HORTOR—co—cor—ar—cor—ar—HORTATUR
4.63-83: in—in—ur—ur—NUNC—in—NUNC—in
5.36-54: adv—ex—adv—ANNUUS—EX—ANNUA—ex

The increasing complexity of patterns in the *Aeneid* is in accord with the trends observed earlier. There is at least on the small scale a definite movement away from the more obvious word repetition towards greater subtlety and variety. The requirements of style, content, and genre may have variously affected the use of *homoeokatarkton* in the three poems, but the decline in word repetition and the corresponding rise in syllabic repetition is too great to be explained on that basis alone. This change seems rather the result of a general stylistic development and increasing experimentation with the variety of effects attainable through repetition. It does not necessarily mean that Vergil gradually came to regard word repetition as undesirable, for in the *Aeneid* he still uses it fairly often, but he may have realized that the effects produced were more limited and overly rhetorical, whereas the repetition of syllables afforded greater flexibility and potential for expressiveness.

2. *Homoeoteleuton*

In considering *homoeokatarkton* no distinction was made between words repeated exactly and those involving some variation of form. This procedure seemed justified, because at the beginning of the verse the initial syllable of a word is more conspicuous than the word ending.[20] However, in the case of *homoeoteleuton* the ending takes on much greater importance, so that it seemed useful to distinguish between all repeated *words* regardless of grammatical form, and words repeated exactly, which hereafter will be called *forms*. In addition, because the verse end is subject to greater metrical constraint, some words may inevitably be repeated there because they occur more frequently in the final position than anywhere else in the hexameter.[21] For this reason I have computed the frequency of repeated

[20] The assumption is that even the recurrence of different forms of the same word would have been conspicuous enough to be avoided (e.g. *urit—urunt*). Admittedly, however, at the beginning of the hexameter spondaic words are much more emphatic than trochaic words (see Norden 1927: 435-36), so that the difference in meter and emphasis may have made such repetitions less objectionable.

[21] This is particularly true of bacchiac (◡——) words, which generally are restricted to the end of the verse when they begin with a consonant and are preferred there when they begin with a vowel. A bacchiac word is not used after the first trochee, because it would produce an undesirable diaeresis at the end of the second foot, which is allowed only when there is a caesura within the same foot (see Raven 1965: 96). After the second trochee it would pro-

words twice: first including the repetition of proper names, and then without names. While Vergil could have avoided the repetition of words normally relegated to the end of the verse (e.g. bacchiac words) by using a synonym, he did not have this option with names (e.g. *Amyntas, Menalcas, Acestes, Menoetes, Cloanthus*), except when he could use a patronymic.[22] Metrical determinism is therefore an important factor, particularly in pastoral and epic, where the subjects of song or the agents of the narrative often have bacchiac names. On the other hand, didactic poetry, being largely descriptive and protreptic, is less likely to impose on the poet the necessity of repeating a name, and in fact there is not a single instance of such repetition in all of the *Georgics*. In the *Eclogues*, however, it comprises

---

duce a diaeresis at the end of the third foot, which is also avoided, because it cuts the hexameter exactly in half. The only possible alternative to the final position is after the third trochee, but such examples are not very common in Vergil (missúsquĕ *sĕcúndō* dḗflŭĭt amni, *G* 3.447; segnī́squĕ *sĕcúndō* dḗfluit amni, *A* 8.549), because normally a weak caesura in the third foot is followed by a strong one in the fourth. Lucretius has a few examples: ĕt *hărḗnāē*, 6.700 (but cf. 6.724 at the end); sit *ĭmā́gō*, 4.174; venit *ĭmā́gō*, 4.316 (but 23 occurrences at the end). The initial vowel or aspirate seems to provide somewhat greater flexibility than the initial consonant, because the latter must be preceded by a word ending in a short vowel so as to form the needed dactyl. Both Lucretius and Vergil place such words as *cŏlōrēs, lăbōrēs, tĭmōrēs* always at the end.

Amphibrachic (◡—◡), spondaic (——), and trochaic (—◡) words provide more flexibility, but even these are often relegated to the final position. An amphibrachic word is avoided after the third trochee, because it would produce weak caesuras in both the third and the fourth feet, unless the short final syllable is elided (cf. Lucr. 4.869, 6.173) or lengthened by position (cf. Lucr. 2.811, 2.757, 4.1146). But it is found occasionally after the first trochee (*ăbī́rĕ*, *A* 4.281; *ămṓrĕ*, *E* 6.10, *A* 5.296, 12.29; *hŏnṓrĕ*, *G* 3.486, *A* 8.76, cf. also Lucr. 2.755), the second trochee (*Nŏtū́squĕ*, *A* 1.85; *hŏnṓrĕ*, *A* 5.272, 11.208, cf. also Lucr. 2.818, 1.36, 4.1101, 4.1141), and the fourth trochee (*rĕpḗntĕ*, *A* 2.380, 465, 7.27; *ămṓrĕ*, *E* 6.46, 10.10, *A* 7.769; *hŏnṓrĕ*, *A* 3.406, 4.458, 12.630, cf. also Lucr. 2.503, 3.992). For the most part, however, such words are found at the end of the line.

Presumably spondaic and trochaic words would be even more flexible. This seems to be true of the latter, especially when they begin with a consonant (*sānguĭs* occurs 8 times in the initial or medial position, and 8 times in the final position; *cōrpŭs*, 19 medial/12 final; *ūmbră* 5/3; *ūndă* 10/6). Spondaic words beginning with a vowel tend on the other hand to be preferred in the final position, because the initial vowel facilitates the dactyl in the fifth foot (e.g. *ūmbrās* 4/24, *ūndās* 2/26). A brief glance at Roberts' Lucretius concordance readily supports these observations. Initial consonants: *sānguĭs* 3/1, *sānctă* 6/3, *cūnctă* 23/1, *mōtūs* 47/12, *cōrpŭs* 91/7; but initial vowels: *aūrās* 1/43, *ūmbrās* 1/5, *ūndās* 0/14, *ūndāē* 1/2, *ūndīs* 0/18, *ūrbēs* 5/7.

[22] There is some evidence that Vergil may have used patronymics to avoid such repetition: *Laertia regna* (3.272, cf. *Ulixi* in 273), *Ithacus* (3.629, cf. *Ulixes* in 628), *Pelidae* (2.548, cf. *Achilles* in 540), *Pelidae* (5.808, cf. *Achilles* in 804), *Pelidae* (12.350, cf. *Achilli* in 352). Yet elsewhere the same name is repeated several times: *Achillem—Achilles—Achilli—Achilles* (1.458-484), *Creusam—Creusae—Creusam—Creusae* (2.769-84), *Menoeten—Menoetes—Menoete—Menoeten—Menoetes* (5.161-179). For Achilles there were at least two patronymics that could have been used, but there was none for Creusa or Menoetes, nor would one have been appropriate. For the frequency of name repetition in Vergil see Kollman (1975: 97-112), who finds that the *Eclogues* contain the highest number of proper names.

43.5% of the words repeated at the end of the hexameter, and 21% in the *Aeneid*. But while the same metrical constraint operates in both the *Eclogues* and the *Aeneid*, the poet's attitude towards the repetition of names is not the same.

In the *Aeneid* such repetitions are apparently tolerated merely as the necessary consequence of any narrative in which some of the principal characters have names like *Cloanthus* and *Acestes*, whereas in the *Eclogues* Vergil seems to have purposely sought out the pleasing musical effect produced by the repetition of Greek names like *Amyntas*, *Palaemon*, or *Iollas*. This difference makes a meaningful statistical evaluation of repeated words more difficult, for the analysis is likely to be biased whether we choose to count repeated names or not. Lumping together both repeated words and names would ignore the contextual and metrical reasons for the repetition of names and thus distort the relationship of the *Eclogues* and *Aeneid* to the *Georgics*, which have no repeated names. On the other hand, the exclusion of names would tend to distort the relationship of the *Eclogues*, where name repetition seems part of a larger fabric of sound, to the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*, where no such reasons for name repetition are apparent. In view of this inherent bias in either type of analysis it has seemed best to correct one set of statistics through the other.

First we shall consider all instances of *words and names* repeated at verse end:

WORD HOMOEOTELEUTA WITHIN TEN LINES

Eclogues:	once every	20.2 lines
Georgics:	once every	41.3 lines
Aeneid 1-6:	once every	32.1 lines

Here the *Aeneid* falls almost exactly between the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics*, but as subsequent figures will show, it is actually much closer to the style of the *Georgics*. In the *Eclogues* the exact forms of words and names are repeated much more frequently and constitute a much higher percentage of all repeated words than in the *Georgics* or the *Aeneid*:

FORM HOMOEOTELEUTA WITHIN TEN LINES

Eclogues:	once every	43.6 lines,	46.3% of all words
Georgics:	once every	136.8 lines,	30.2% of all words
Aeneid 1-6:	once every	110.6 lines,	29.1% of all words

The high frequency of repeated forms in the *Eclogues* may be attributed to the preference of pastoral for symmetry and parallelism (see below, pp. 39-55), while the fact that they comprise a sizable percentage of word repetition suggests that Vergil either was not as fastidious in avoiding

repeated forms, or perhaps even repeated some of them on purpose. The difference between the *Eclogues* and the other two poems becomes especially clear if we look at the statistics for words repeated within three lines:

WORD HOMOEOTELEUTA WITHIN THREE LINES

Eclogues:	once every	63.8 lines,	31.7% of all words
Georgics:	once every	364.7 lines,	11.3% of all words
Aeneid 1-6:	once every	297.2 lines,	10.8% of all words

The low frequency and percentages of such repetition in the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid* show how carefully it was avoided.

The frequency statistics have so far included repeated names. *If names are not counted*, the figures for the *Eclogues* and the *Aeneid* become substantially altered, but they still support the observations made earlier that there is a general development toward more discriminating repetition.[23] Although the exclusion of names tends to diminish the difference between the *Eclogues* and the other two poems, the *Eclogues* still continue to exhibit the highest frequency in each category. But more important is the discovery that in the use of repeated words Vergil was even more restrained in the *Aeneid* than in the *Georgics*. This is most dramatically illustrated by the occurrence of word repetition within three lines, which is not uncommon in the *Eclogues* (every 103.6 lines), but rare in the *Georgics* (every 364.7 lines), and rarer still in the *Aeneid* (every 432.3 lines). Such a low frequency in the *Aeneid* suggests that at least on the small scale the poem had received a degree of finish comparable to that of the *Georgics*.

As the number of word repetitions falls, there is a corresponding rise in assonance and rime. Ancient rhetoricians recognize the potential effectiveness of *similiter desinentia* (cf. *Rhet. Her.* 4.20.28), but warn against

[23] The statistics for word repetition *without names* may be summarized as follows:

WORD HOMOEOTELEUTA WITHIN TEN LINES

Eclogues:	once every 36.0 lines
Georgics:	once every 41.3 lines
Aeneid 1-6:	once every 41.3 lines

FORM HOMOEOTELEUTA WITHIN TEN LINES

Eclogues:	once every 118.4 lines,	30.4% of all words
Georgics:	once every 136.8 lines,	30.2% of all words
Aeneid 1-6:	once every 144.1 lines,	28.7% of all words

WORD HOMOEOTELEUTA WITHIN THREE LINES

Eclogues:	once every 103.6 lines,	34.8% of all words
Georgics:	once every 364.7 lines,	11.3% of all words
Aeneid 1-6:	once every 432.3 lines,	7.4% of all words

excess (cf. *Rhet. Her.* 4.12.18, Quint. 9.4.12), and Servius occasionally faults Vergil for iterating the same final syllable (cf. on *A* 4.504, 9.44). Norden (1927: 405-407) cites many examples where Vergil appears to have introduced changes aimed at avoiding *homoeoteleuton* in successive words. The same degree of sensitivity does not seem to apply to syllabic *homoeoteleuton* between lines. True rime, though quite rare in adjoining verses, is more common within ten-line passages, and its musical effect is further supplemented through frequent assonance of final syllables:

RIME AND FINAL ASSONANCE WITHIN TEN LINES[24]

	RIME	ASSONANCE	TOTAL
Eclogues (830)	every 36.0 lines	every 39.5 lines	every 18.8 lines
Georgic 1 (514)	every 34.3 lines	every 12.9 lines	every 9.3 lines
Aeneid 1 (756)	every 15.8 lines	every 12.4 lines	every 6.9 lines

Though the figures for the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid* are based on a smaller sample than before, they should be sufficiently representative to allow some general conclusions. If, as it is sometimes maintained, assonances and rimes derive naturally from the jingles which are part of any highly inflected language, then we would expect the frequency to remain fairly constant. Instead, there is a gradual increase which parallels what we have observed earlier about syllabic *homoeokatarkton* (see above, p. 29), though the reasons for such an increase need not be the same. As we move from the *Eclogues* to the *Georgics*, we find that the doubling of assonance and rime (18.8 to 9.3) balances a corresponding reduction in word *homoeoteleuta* (20.2 to 41.3), which suggests that syllable echo, rather than being sought deliberately, may simply be a function of avoiding word echo. Yet in the *Aeneid* such repetition of words (particularly when names are excluded) is no more common than in the *Georgics*, although it has more than twice as much rime (15.8 to 34.3). If this high incidence of rime is to be attributed to the work's unfinished state, we would have expected

[24] The rimes included here correspond in the last two syllables, e.g. dol*ores*—hon*ores* (1.25, 28), par*entem*—pot*entem* (1.75, 80), tim*orem*—dol*orem* (1.202, 209), iac*entes*—nit*entes* (1.224, 228), while the instances of final assonance were counted only if they comprised a full syllable, e.g. pon*to*—acu*to* (1.40, 45), son*oras*—*iras*—au*ras* (1.53, 57, 59), cer*to*—ven*to*—pon*to* (1.62, 66, 70), pon*o*—Iun*o* (1.279-80), vo*tis*—ar*tis* (1.290, 293), cruen*to*—al*to* (1.296-97).

that final assonance would also be more common—it is not. It seems more likely that in the course of time Vergil came to recognize the great variety and subtlety of effect attainable through syllable echo and as a result experimented more with both rime and assonance.[25]

3. *Homoeokatarkton, Homoeoteleuton, and Repetition*

The repetition of words is a phenomenon that is related to the repetition of lines, but it need not be governed by the same artistic or stylistic principles, and we therefore should not expect to find a direct correlation between the frequencies of repeated words and repeated lines. Both Cicero's *Aratea* (fr. 34.1-480 Traglia) and Catullus 64 contain few longer repetitions (excepting the refrains in Catullus), but while in Catullus repeated words at verse end are even less frequent than in Vergil's *Aeneid* and *Georgics* (once every 68.0 lines), they are very common in Cicero (once every 14.1 lines). On the other hand, the first book of Lucretius has a slightly higher frequency of word repetition (once every 12.6 lines) than Cicero's *Aratea*, but this small increase does not at all match the enormous rise in verse and phrase repetition found in Lucretius. Thus similar frequency of word repetition in the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid* should not lead us to expect such similarity in the case of repeated lines, nor to follow Sparrow in speculating that the *Aeneid* would have had far fewer repetitions if Vergil had only lived to finish revising it. Of course, when dealing with a posthumous work we cannot refute such theories by means of statistics alone, for ultimately the repetitions have to be judged on the basis of how effective and appropriate they are in their contexts, but the statistics may have some bearing on the probability of such theories.

Had the use of word repetition in the *Aeneid* been indiscriminate, it would have been difficult to avoid the conclusion that the poem was simply unfinished, and that many repetitions would probably have been removed in the course of revision. But since word repetition is rare enough to meet the exacting standards of the *Georgics*, we are faced with an apparent paradox. If Vergil had been so careful to avoid excessive word repetition,

[25] R. G. Austin (1927: 100-105; 1929: 46-55) finds that assonance and rime are used deliberately in prophecies (imitating the Sibylline manner), for emphasis in vivid narrative, and as clausulae that bring passages to a close—a view he restates more cautiously in his commentaries (cf. on 4.55; 2.125, 457; 1.626; 6.77-97, 213, 469). See also Pease on 4.54, 256; Norden on 6.468; Williams on 3.655-58, 5.81, 385-86. Others who have recognized the structural or musical effectiveness of assonance and rime in Vergil include Johnstone (1896), Michenaud (1953), and W. M. Clarke (1972). The most thorough discussion of the history of rime is still Norden (1918: 810-908). See also Kvíčala (1881: 275-92); Deutsch (1939: 121-76); Marouzeau (1946: 51-65); Herescu (1953; 1960: 135-80).

how could we account for the presence of so many repetitions of phrases and lines? One could suppose that Vergil had managed to revise the poem on the small scale, but had not been able to remove or vary the many repetitions occurring farther apart. But this fails to explain why he should have carried the revision of the smaller units as far as he did, if the larger episodes in the *Aeneid* were still full of stop-gaps and unfinished parts that had to be changed or rewritten. Although it may be easier to avoid a repeated word within ten lines than a repeated verse within a thousand lines or more, one still would expect a great deal more accidental word repetition, if the *Aeneid* had in fact received so little revision. Our study of word repetition seems to suggest that revision had progressed fairly far, so that many repetitions would surely have been noticed and removed whenever judged inappropriate or offensive. While no doubt Vergil would have revised a number of passages more thoroughly and perhaps even rewritten them, most of the major changes seem to have been completed, and subsequent revision probably would have affected relatively few repetitions.[26] Actually the longer repetitions (10 to 12 elements) are by no means very conspicuous, for they are less frequent in the individual books of the *Aeneid* than in the *Georgics* or *Eclogues*, just as there is a similar decline in repeated words. Shorter repetitions abound in the *Aeneid*, and so do rime and final assonance, but these are less obtrusive and would probably have been retained, especially since Vergil may have felt that they provided a measure of epic coloration. The longer repetitions may well have served the same purpose, although generally they seem to be used much more self-consciously than Homer's formulae.

B. *Some Aspects of the Bucolic Style*

Symmetrical word placement and parallel sentence structure in Vergil have long been noticed.[27] Norden in his commentary on *Aeneid* 6 had originally attributed this idiosyncrasy to the influence of rhetoric, but in the second edition (1915) he considerably modified his view, having come to recognize that such parallelism is very common in popular poetry, epithalamia, and pastoral, and hence should be regarded as a characteristic of the low style.[28] This change was largely brought about by

[26] Cf. G. P. Goold (1970: 155): "Nothing entitles us to imagine that Virgil composed in such a way that his verses needed polishing up. Completion of unfinished passages; addition to give finality to scene or action; and, above all, smooth connection of portions separately composed: these the poem lacks. But perfection of language the *Aeneid* already possesses, like every foot of verse that Virgil ever fashioned."

[27] See for example Kvíčala (1881: 274-93) and Belling (1899: *passim*).

[28] See Norden (1927: 380-82).

the dissertation of Rudolf Gimm (1910) on parallel structures in bucolic poetry. Because Gimm had defined his categories more precisely than Norden, he was able to distinguish between degrees of symmetry and parallelism. Concentrating on the symmetry produced by the penthemimeral caesura (pp. 10-44) and on the symmetrical arrangement of verses and couplets (pp. 61-78), he found that exact symmetry is much more common in the *Eclogues* and in the bucolic poems of Theocritus than in the *Georgics*, the *Aeneid*, and the non-bucolic poems of the Theocritean corpus. According to Gimm (p. 15), such symmetry produces a *suavitas* or *iucunditas* which is avoided in the loftier styles, except to evoke a bucolic mood or emphasize the pathos of a scene (pp. 16-18):

G 1.341	*tum* pingu*es* agn*i*/ et *tum* mollissima vina, *tum* somn*i* dulc*es*/ densaeque in montibus umbrae.
G 4.465	*te*, dulcis coniunx,/ *te* solo in litore secum, *te* veni*ente* die,/ *te* deced*ente* canebat.
A 1.120	*iam* validam Ilionei navem, *iam* fortis Achatae, *et qua* vectus *A*bas/ *et qua* grandaev*us A*letes,
A 1.699	*iam* pater Aeneas/ et *iam* Troiana iuventus conveniunt,
A 12.318	has *inter* voces,/ media *inter* talia verba ecce viro stridens alis adlapsa sagitta est
A 12.698	*deserit et* muros/ *et* summas *deserit* arces praecipitatque moras *omnes*, opera *omnia* rumpit.

Passages of this sort are comparatively rare in the *Georgics* or the *Aeneid*, and even these Vergil tends to modify through changes in word order and language, so as to avoid excessive symmetry.[29]

The aspects of the bucolic style discussed by Gimm are related to repetition, for symmetry and parallelism are essentially attempts to create order through repeated patterns—be they metrical, verbal, or structural. The main value of Gimm's work was in providing a carefully devised method for recognizing quantitative differences in style, but like all such studies it gave the appearance of stylistic uniformity, when in fact the phenomena measured were products of diverse causes. By treating the bucolic tradition as a homogeneous entity, Gimm by implication granted Theocritus conscious control over the style of what only later came to be recognized as

[29] In *G* 1.342 Vergil writes *tum somni dulces*, thereby not only inverting the adjective-noun sequence established in the previous line, but also avoiding exact correspondence to that line's initial hemistich (i.e. /*tum* pingu*es* agn*i*..../*tum* dulc*es* somn*i*). Cf. also Wilkinson (1963: 194-197), E. A. Schmidt (1972: 66).

a separate genre.[30] Generic styles do not arise as a result of conscious conformity to some set of rules, but evolve gradually from a spontaneous interaction among contextual elements, literary models, and perceived generic forces. In the absence of a clearly defined generic tradition, content and context were of much greater importance in Theocritus. Some aspects of popular poetry may well have been influential, but we should not treat it as if it were the generic precursor of pastoral, particularly when our knowledge of that poetry rests on a few literary epithalamia and a small, metrically heterogeneous group of fragments. It is much more likely that the symmetry in Theocritus[31] stems not from a conscious decision to imitate the style of popular poetry, but from those elements which upon adoption in his poetry would have encouraged the development of symmetrical patterns. In other words, these are not qualities derived from abstract archetypes, but analogical formations produced by specific examples under special conditions. In such a process the most powerful stimuli would have been the *refrain*, the *catalogue*, and above all the *amoebaean song*. However these were used outside the pastoral setting, they seem to have become identified with the genre at an early stage. The genre gained clearer definition only in retrospect when in the course of time the concrete manifestations of contextual forces had come to be perceived as characteristic qualities governing the style as a whole.[32] The emergence of such stylistic self-consciousness complicates the question of symmetry in the *Eclogues*, for while Vergil's style was affected by context, it was also influenced by his awareness of generic patterns and his deliberate imitations of specific Theocritean passages. But let us see how the three elements just mentioned may have helped to generate symmetry and repetition.

It is possible that actual singing matches among shepherds in Sicily or elsewhere served as models for the bucolic contests in Theocritus, though it is not necessary to entertain such a hypothesis to account for their role in

[30] Muecke (1975) has emphasized this crucial difference between Theocritus, who writes at the beginning of a generic tradition before its characteristics had become fixed, and Vergil, who works in an inherited genre. The Idylls, of course, begin as a mixture of genres and styles (cf. Fabiano 1971; Van Sickle 1975, 1976: 19-22), a characteristic they share with other Hellenistic poetry (cf. Rossi 1971: 83-86), which in turn is picked up by the Roman poets (cf. Kroll 1924: 202-24).

[31] A detailed description of the various forms of symmetry is to be found in Legrand (1898: 375-402). See also Cholmeley (1919: 36-45) and the excellent summary in Dover (1971: xlv-l).

[32] By this I do not mean the codification of rules, but the gradual recognition that certain features had generic significance. For the development of the bucolic genre see E. A. Schmidt (1972: 9-17) and Van Sickle (1975, 1976).

the genre.[33] Amoebaean song seems to have been old and fairly widespread, and even if some of its forms may have disappeared, others have passed into literature.[34] Theocritus was surely familiar with the latter, and probably had some acquaintance with whatever amoebaean songs survived in the popular tradition. The pattern need not derive from a single source, but once adopted, its encouragement to the use of symmetry and repetition would have been decisive. In an amoebaean setting, where the second singer must cap his rival's verse, there similarity of thought, structure, and subject matter will inevitably arise.[35] But what is functional and spontaneous in an actual contest becomes more and more decorative as the literary form develops.

The range of what I call *amoebaean repetition* extends from echoes of sound and meter to the repetition of words, phrases, and complete lines. Theocritus is rather sparing in the use of longer repetitions:

Id. 5.4 — τόν **μευ τὰν σύριγγα** πρόαν **κλέψαντα Κομάταν**;
Id. 5.19 — οὔ **τευ τὰν σύριγγα** λαθὼν ἔ**κλεψε Κομάτας**.

Id. 5.69 — ἐν χάριτι κρί**νης**, **μήτ' ὦν τύγα το**ῦτον ὀνάσῃς.
Id. 5.71 — τὸ πλέον ἰθύ**νης**, **μήτ' ὦν τύγα τ**ῷδε χαρίξῃ.

Instead he prefers to rely on the repetition of names and emphatic words to articulate the amoebaean nature of the paired speeches:

Id. 5.50 — ἦ μὰν ἀρνακίδας τε καὶ εἴρια τεῖ**δε πατησεῖς**,
αἴ κ' ἔνθῃς, ὕπνω **μαλακώτερα· τ**αὶ δὲ τραγεῖαι

[33] The Theocritus scholia (Wendel 1914: 2-3, 7-9) maintain that pastoral poetry derives from singing contests once held in honor of Artemis. Merkelbach (1956) gives an impressive list of modern examples to support the existence of bucolic contests in antiquity, but A. D. Pagliaro (1975) questions the validity of reconstructing the details of ancient song contests on the basis of modern evidence, suggesting instead that the amoebaean songs in Theocritus are indebted to Aesopian fables. Knaack, *RE* 3 (1899) 999-1001, did not question the existence of rustic poetry, but was sceptical about the ritual origin of pastoral. Van Sickle has recently shown (1976: 27-35; cf. also 1975) that the idea of pastoral as "mimesis of rustic things" can probably be traced back to Artemidorus.

[34] Some of the Greek *carmina popularia* and *skolia* contain amoebaean repetition (e.g. 17-18D, 36D), suggesting that this kind of verse was not unusual in folk poetry. All our examples of epithalamia are literary. Of these some are clearly amoebaean (e.g. Sappho fr. 131D, Ar. *Pax* 1332-54, Catull. 62) and probably reflect the amoebaean nature of primitive epithalamia. The degree of parallelism between the songs of the youths and maidens in Catull. 62 is particularly remarkable (cf. 1 ~ 6, 20f. ~ 26f., 24 ~ 30, 45 ~ 56). See also Maas (1914), Wheeler (1930), Muth (1954), Fraenkel (1955). The *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi* dates from the Hadrianic period, but seems based on an earlier version by Alcidamas, which Theocritus probably knew. For other connections cf. Knaack, *RE* 3 (1899) 1000-1004.

[35] Such exchanges may have been part of the mimes of Sophron, which seem to have influenced the bucolic dialogue. Parallelism will, of course, occur in any heated debate, such as the stichomythy of tragedy and comedy: e.g. Soph. *O.R.* 547-52; Eur. *Med.* 1370-74; Ar. *Lys.* 373-74, *Nub.* 908-909, *Ach.* 1097-98, 1105-1106, 1118-19, 1124-42, 1208-1209, 1215-21.

ταὶ παρὰ τὶν ὄσδοντι κακώτερον ἤ τύ περ ὄσδεις.
στασῶ δὲ κρατῆρα μέγαν λευκοῖο **γάλακτος**
ταῖς Νύμφαις, στασῶ δὲ καὶ ἁδέος ἄλλον ἐλαίω.
55 — **αἰ** δέ **κε** καὶ τὺ μόλ**ῃς**, ἁπαλὰν πτέριν ὧ**δε πατησεῖς**
καὶ γλάχων' ἀνθεῦσαν· ὑπεσσεῖται δὲ χιμαιρᾶν
δέρματα τᾶν παρὰ τὶν **μαλακώτερα τ**ετράκις ἀρνᾶν.
στασῶ δ' ὀκτὼ μὲν γαυλὼς τῷ Πανὶ **γάλακτος**,
ὀκτὼ δὲ σκαφίδας μέλιτος πλέα κηρί' ἐχοίσας.[36]

This contrasts sharply with the exaggerated symmetry one finds occasionally in the Eighth *Idyll*:

Id. 8.11 — **χρῄσδ**εις ὦν **ἐσιδεῖν**; **χρῄσδ**εις **καταθεῖναι ἄεθλον**;
— **χρῄσδω** τοῦτ' **ἐσιδεῖν**, **χρῄσδω καταθεῖναι ἄεθλον.**

Id. 8.18 — **σύριγγ'** ἃν ἐπόησα καλὰν **ἔχω ἐννεάφωνον**,
λευκὸν κηρὸν ἔχοισαν ἴσον κάτω ἶσον ἄνωθεν·
21 — ἦ μάν τοι κἠγὼ **σύριγγ' ἔχω ἐννεάφωνον**,
λευκὸν κηρὸν ἔχοισαν ἴσον κάτω ἶσον ἄνωθεν.

Here the author, who elsewhere resorts to more subtle devices (e.g. *Id.*, 8.33-40, 41-48), betrays the zeal of an imitator at pains to sustain the poem's amoebaean mood. Evidently the bucolic style had by then become sufficiently fixed that amoebaean repetition came to be regarded as an important distinguishing feature.[37]

In Vergil longer amoebaean repetitions are also rare, occurring only where Damoetas mocks Menalcas by aping a whole verse (*E* 3.43 = 47) and at the very end of the contest, where they form a fitting climax:

E 3.104 D—*Dic quibus in terris* (et eris mihi magnus Apollo)
tris pateat caeli spatium non amplius ulnas.
M—*Dic quibus in terris* inscripti nomina regum
nascantur flores, et Phyllida solus habeto.

Normally Vergil emphasizes symmetry through less obvious means:

E 3.49 M—Numquam hodie effugi*es*;/ veniam quocumque vocaris.
audiat haec *tantum*—vel qui venit ecc*e Palaemon*.
efficiam posthac *ne quemquam* voce laess*as*.
D—Quin age, si quid hab*es*;/in me mora non erit ulla,
nec quemquam fugio: *tantum*, vicin*e Palaemon*,
sensibus haec imis (res est non parva) repon*as*.

[36] See also *Id.* 4.5 ~ 6, 13 ~ 14, 38 ~ 42, 41 ~ 44; *Id.* 5.31 ~ 35, 61 ~ 63, 72 ~ 74, 100 ~ 102, 112 ~ 114, 116 ~ 118, 124 ~ 126, 132 ~ 134f.

[37] On the emergence of amoebaean song as a generic characteristic see Van Sickle (1975: 22-23; 1976: 23-26).

E 3.76 D—*Phyllida* mitte *m*ihi: *m*eus est natalis, *Iolla*;
cum faciam vitula pro frugibus, ipse venito.
M—*Phyllida* amo *a*nte *a*lias; nam me discedere flevit
et longum 'formose, vale, vale,' inquit, '*Iolla*.'[38]

E 7.37 C—Nerine Galatea, thymo m*ihi* dulc*ior* *H*yblae,
cand*idior* cycnis,/hedera formos*ior* *a*lba,
cum pri*mum* *pasti* repetent praesepia tau*ri*,
si qua tui Corydonis habet te cura, venito.
T—Immo ego Sardoniis videar t*ibi* amar*ior* *h*erbis,
horr*idior* rusco,/proiecta vil*ior* *a*lga,
si mihi non haec lux toto iam longior anno est.
ite do*mum* *pasti*, si quis pudor, ite iuvenc*i*.

Yet patterns generate other analogous patterns. From amoebaean symmetry it is but a small step to symmetry and repetition within the individual repartees, such as we find in the last exchange of *Eclogue* 7, where Thyrsis carefully imitates the priamel, the structure, and the internal repetition of Corydon's quatrain:

E 7.59 T—*Phylli*dis adventu nostrae nemus omne vire*bit*,
Iuppiter et laeto descendet plurimus imbr*I*.
C—*Populus* Alcidae gratiss*ima*,/ vitis Iacch*O*,
formosae MYRTUS Veneri, sua LAUREA PHOEB*O*;
*Phylli*s amat corylos:/ illas dum Phyllis ama*bit*,
nec MYRTUS vincet corylos, nec LAUREA PHOEB*I*.
T—FRAXINUS IN SILVIS pulcherr*ima*,/PINUS IN HOR*TIS*,
populus in fluviis, abies in montibus al*TIS*:
saepius at si me,/ Lycida formose, revisas,
FRAXINUS IN SILVIS cedat tibi, PINUS IN HORTIS.

It matters not that here we have the work of a highly self-conscious poet who was known for working slowly and revising much. The impetus for the present form had to come from some source, and even if Vergil did think of a comparable Theocritean passage, it seems more likely that the initial idea for the symmetrical arrangement would have been suggested by the amoebaean nature of the poem.

The *catalogue* and related figures, such as the priamel, constitute another important feature of the style.[39] Both devices are old and go back to the oral tradition.[40] The priamel, already illustrated in the passage just quoted, is a multiple comparison in the form of a catalogue, which is constructed so as to lead up to the author's main point, as in the following:

Id. 10.30 ἁ αἴξ τὰν κύτισον, ὁ λύκος τὰν αἶγα διώκει,
ἁ γέρανος τὤροτρον· ἐγὼ δ'ἐπὶ τὶν μεμάνημαι,

which is imitated by Vergil:

E 2.63 torva leaena lup*um* *sequitur*, *l*upus ipse *capella*m,
florentem cytis*um* *sequitur* *l*asciva *capella*,
te Corydon, o Alexi.

These figures encourage the formation of symmetrical patterns in general, because they are among the most common and prominent examples of anaphora, isocolon, and parallelism:

E 3.56 et *nunc omnis* ager, *nunc omnis* parturit arbos,
*nunc f*rondent silvae, *nunc f*ormosissimus annus.

E 5.16 *lenta* salix *quantum* pal*lenti* *cedit* olivae,
puniceis humilis *quantum* saliunca rosetis,
iudicio nostro *tantum* tibi *cedit* Amyntas.

E 5.76 *dum* iuga montis aper, fluvios *dum* piscis amabit,
*dum*que thymo pascentur apes, *dum* rore cicadae,
semper honos nomenque tuum laudesque manebunt.

E 10.29 *nec* lacrimis crudelis Amor *nec* gramina rivis
nec cytiso saturantur apes *nec* fronde capellae.[41]

By Vergil's time such catalogues are bucolic commonplaces, even if some of them are direct imitations of Theocritus:

Id. 1.71 **τῆνον** μὰν θῶες, **τῆνον** λύκοι ὠρύσαντο,
τῆνον χὠκ δρυμοῖο λέων ἔκλαυσε θανόντα.

E 10.13 *illum etiam* lauri, *etiam flevere* myricae,
pinifer *illum etiam* sola sub rupe iacentem
Maenalus et gelidi *fleverunt* saxa Lycaei.

Id. 8.3 **ἄμφω** τώγ' ἤστην πυρροτρίχω, **ἄμφω** ἀνάβω,
ἄμφω συρίσ**δεν** δεδαημένω, **ἄμφω** ἀεί**δεν**.

E 7.4 *ambo* florentes aetatibus, Arcades *ambo*,
et cantar*e* *par*es *et* responder*e* *par*ati.[42]

---

[38] See also *E* 3.84-87, and the elaborate rime pattern in *E* 3.12-22.

[39] Cf. Guillemin (1951: 44-45).

[40] Lists of various kinds are ubiquitous in Homer and Hesiod, and at times they naturally produce isocolon and parallel verse structures emphasized through anaphora: e.g. Hom. *Il.* 2.503-505, 521-23, 632-35; Hes. *Th.* 830-35, *Op.* 5-7, 25-26, 182-84, 246-47, 253-56, 578-80, 715-16, 750-59; *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 211-15, *Merc.* 263-66, 363-64, 567-70, *Ven.* 92-99. The priamel occurs in Sappho 27D, but must be older, since what Hector says to Andromache (*Il.* 6.450-55) is cast in a similar form.

[41] For other examples of catalogues, priamels, and *adynata* see *E* 1.22-23, *E* 3.60-61, *E* 4.32-36, *E* 5.62-64, *E* 7.37-38, *E* 7.41-43; *E* 3.80-83, *E* 5.82-84; *E* 1.59-63, *E* 8.52-56.

[42] For other imitations of Theocritean catalogues and comparisons see *Id.* 1.7-8 > *E* 5.45-47, *Id.* 1.66-69 > *E* 10.9-12, *Id.* 1.77-81 > *E* 10.19-21, *Id.* 8.79-80 > *E* 5.32-34, *Id.* 10.27-28 > *E* 2.18 and *E* 10.39, *Id.* 11.20 > *E* 7.37, *Id.* 11.45-47 > *E* 9.40-42 and *E* 10.42-43.

The catalogue may have been adopted because it lent the poems a rustic simplicity, but it becomes a vehicle through which the bucolic world is perceived, so that lists and comparisons function as dominant metaphors and modes of thought. The First *Idyll* begins by comparing the goatherd's piping to the whispering pine:

> **ἁδύ τι τὸ** ψιθύρισμα καὶ **ἁ** πίτυς, αἰπόλε, τήνα,
> **ἁ ποτὶ ταῖς** παγαῖσι, μελίσδεται, **ἁδὺ** δὲ καὶ τύ
> συρίσδες·

It adumbrates the potential sympathy between man and nature more fully expressed elsewhere:

Id. 9.7 **ἁδὺ** μὲν **ἁ** μόσχος γαρύεται, **ἁδὺ δὲ χἀ** βῶς,
ἁδὺ δὲ χἀ σῦριγξ χὠ βουκόλος, **ἁδὺ δὲ** κἠγών,

and realized at the death of Daphnis (cf. *Id.* 1.66-75, 132-34).[43] What is ἁδύ may take many forms:

Id. 8.76 **ἁδεῖ** ἁ φωνὰ τᾶς πόρτιος, **ἁδὺ** τὸ πνεῦμα,
78 **ἁδὺ** δὲ τῶ θέρεος παρ' ὕδωρ ῥέον αἰθριοχοιτεῖν,

all of which are part of the pastoral harmony and are treated as equivalent.[44] Likes and dislikes are subjective, for the cicada, ant, and hawk cannot share the poet's love of song (cf. *Id.* 9.31-35), nor can waters, birds, and beasts know passion for a girl (cf. *Id.* 8.57-59). The bucolic *locus amoenus* is thus a balanced arrangement where each element has its proper place (cf. *Id.* 11.45-47, *E* 9.40-42, *E* 10.42-43), so that the symmetry itself contributes to the feeling of peace and contentment.[45]

The *refrain* is probably the oldest and most primitive form of organizing a body of verse.[46] Its influence may be traced in several ways. The regular

[43] It is analogous to the sympathy between poetry and nature expressed in the recurring image of forest groves echoing pastoral song (see Desport 1941). Damon (1961: 281-90) perceives such echo in agonistic terms "as the second part in a kind of amoeban song between man and nature" (p. 281), whereas Segal (1975: 132-35) speaks of a virtual fusion between song and the bucolic landscape. For Boyle (1977) the echoic properties of pastoral song reveal its limitations—"the internal resonance of the singer's fictive world, condemned to triviality by its inability to reach beyond the boundaries of private experience" (p. 121), but he suggests that they also determine the chiastic structure of the book and the many echoes of theme and language.

[44] On sweetness as a characteristic motif of the genre closely related to the Callimachean stylistic ideal see E. A. Schmidt (1972: 19-32) and Van Sickle (1975: 13, 15, 23-24).

[45] This analysis of the catalogue pattern has dealt with the Theocritean corpus as a single entity so as to recognize the nature of the tradition inherited by Vergil. Since, however, several of the examples come from the spurious poems, it seems that the process of relating the catalogue to the larger symmetries of pastoral was a later development.

[46] The occurrence of refrains in literary epithalamia (e.g. Sappho 123D; Ar. *Pax* 1332-54; Catull. 61, 62, 64.323-81), hymns, and paeans (see J. U. Powell 1925: 136-40, 160-69)

repetition of the refrain creates a sense of symmetry which in turn affects the structure of individual verses and stanzas, and even leads to some echoes between stanzas. In Theocritus anaphora emphasizes the symmetry of verses and hemistichs more often in the refrain poems than in the others.[47] At times the stanza's content itself may have suggested parallel sentence structure and anaphora (e.g. *Id.* 2.28-31), but symmetry also seems to become an end in itself:

Id. 1.120 **Δάφνις** ἐγὼν ὅδε τῆνος **ὁ τὰς** βόας **ὧδε νομεύων**,
Δάφνις ὁ τὼς ταύρως καὶ πόρτιας **ὧδε ποτίσδων**.

There is also some evidence that Theocritus strives to balance stanzas through the repetition of patterns, words, or longer phrases:

Id. 1.87 ᾡπόλος, ὅκ**κ' ἐσορῇ τὰς** μηκάδας **οἷα** βατεῦ**νται**,
τάκεται ὀφθαλμὼς ὅτι οὐ τράγος αὐτὸς ἔγεντο.

Id. 1.90 καὶ τὺ δ' ἐπεί **κ' ἐσορῇς τὰς** παρθένος **οἷα** γελᾶ**ντι**,
τάκεαι ὀφθαλμὼς ὅτι οὐ μετὰ ταῖσι χορεύεις.[48]

In *Eclogue* 8 we may observe similar features, such as jingles (80), homoeokatarkton (69-70), balanced tricola (41, 44), and several echoes and repetitions:

E 8.29 Mops*e*, novas inci*de* fa*ces: tibi d*ucitur uxor.
sparg*e*, mari*te*, nu*ces: tibi d*eserit Hesperus Oetam.

E 8.77 *necte* tribus nodis, *Amarylli*, colores;
necte, *Amarylli*, modo et 'Veneris' dic 'vincula necto'.

E 8.47 saevus Amor docuit natorum sanguine matrem
commaculare manus; *crudelis tu quoque, mater.*
crudelis mater magis, an PUER IMPROBUS ILLE?
IMPROBUS ILLE PUER; *crudelis tu quoque, mater.*

E 8.85 *talis amor* Daphnin qualis cum fessa iuvencum
per nemora atque altos quaerendo bucula lucos
propter aquae rivum viridi procumbit in ulva
*per*dita, nec serae meminit decedere nocti,
talis amor teneat, nec sit mihi cura mederi.

presumably reflects the popular tradition and suggests that ultimately their origin must lie with ritual and magic incantations.

[47] In *Idylls* 1 and 2 anaphora marks the symmetry of hemistichs every 9.5 and 11.1 lines. This is surpassed only by the spurious *Idylls* 8 and 9 (every 9.3 and 7.2 lines), and by the *Epitaphios Bionos* attributed to Moschus (every 9.0 lines). The frequency of such anaphora in the other *Idylls* (3-7, 10, 11) is much lower, averaging once every 21.8 lines.

[48] In *Id.* 1.71-72 the tricolon (τῆνον) and the verse end ὠρύσαντο are balanced through another tricolon (πολλαί) and ὠδύραντο in vv. 74-75. Cf. also the repetition of ἦνθε, ἦνθον in vv. 77, 80, 95.

Although parallel hemistichs with anaphora are not very frequent in this *Eclogue* (once in 22.0 lines), they are in *Eclogues* 5 and 10 (once in 7.5 and 8.6 lines), both of which draw heavily on the song of Thyrsis in *Idyll* 1. Yet in other respects Vergil has gone far beyond Theocritus to articulate the symmetry of his poem, and he did so by exploiting more fully the structural properties of the refrain.

In the First *Idyll* the refrain consists of three variations on the same theme, each of which occurs with varying frequency (seven, eight, and four times) and marks off sections of different length. The changes in vv. 94 and 127 punctuate the narrative at significant points—the arrival of Kypris and the return of Pan's pipe, but they do nothing to enhance the symmetry observed elsewhere in the poem. In the Second *Idyll* the refrain structure is more regular. The two refrains occur ten and twelve times, forming stanzas of equal length, but there is little continuity between the two sections, although the appeal to Selene in the second refrain continues the magical associations of the first part. Nor is there balance, for the second part is substantially longer than the first, while the last part has no refrains at all. The narrative follows a circular pattern, symbolized perhaps by the spinning of the magic wheel, for the spell leads to the recollection of love's first bliss, then to disappointment and despair, and finally back to the spell.[49]

Vergil combined two refrain songs in an amoebaean setting, balancing Damon's despair with the *Pharmaceutria* of Alphesiboeus, and in so doing put traditional forms to new use. The two Theocritean songs move either in a linear (Thyrsis) or circular (Simaetha) fashion. Vergil's poem moves antithetically, contrasting love lost with love regained, which has the effect of placing each experience within a larger dialectic. The antithesis is further emphasized through careful responsion between the two sections of the poem, for each shepherd sings 36 verses divided through the refrains into ten stanzas, of which the first seven correspond exactly in length and sometimes even in subject matter, while the last three merely follow a different sequence (4,5,3/5,3,4).[50] Finally, the refrains themselves help to

---

[49] Lawall (1961) argues persuasively for the structural unity of the poem. The symmetrical patterns, strophic arrangement, and framing repetitions (18-21 ~ 58-62) all do suggest careful and highly self-conscious composition, but (unlike Vergil) Theocritus is not interested in extending the symmetry to the structure of the whole poem. For contrast and antithesis in the *Idylls* see Ott (1969).

[50] This is the pattern one gets by retaining (with most modern editors) lines 28a and 76, which yields nine identical refrains and one closing refrain. The *ten* refrains of Simaetha's incantation would support this number, except that in Theocritus they mark off *nine* stanzas. Skutsch (1969) believes that lines 28a and 76 should be omitted. The resulting pattern is

articulate the thematic contrast and symmetrical structure of the poem, for Alphesiboeus' closing refrain recalls the pattern and rhythm of Damon's:

E 8.109 *parcite*, ab urbe venit, *iam parcite, carmina*, Daphnis.
E 8.61 *desine* Maenalios, *iam desine, tibia*, versus,

while the other refrains also echo each other:

E 8.68 etc. duc*ite* ab urbe dom*um*, *mea* carm*ina*, ducite Daphnin.
E 8.21 etc. inc*ipe* Maenalios mec*um*, *mea* tib*ia*, versus.

Whether these similarities derive from conscious planning or from the fact that the content of refrains is predictable and readily assumes the same metrical configuration, it is clear that Vergil made his refrains serve the larger symmetry of the poem. Compared to how Theocritus uses refrains, it is a significant innovation, although in effect it is but a logical extension of the refrain's structural function.

The symmetry generated by refrains, catalogues, and amoebaean contests encourages symmetrical patterns of thought in the other poems. Sometimes the actions and events described are inherently parallel, as in *Idyll* 11, where Galatea appears to Polyphemus in his dreams and disappears when he awakens:

Id. 11.22 φοι**τῇς δ' αὖθ'** οὕτως **ὄκκα γλυκὺς ὕπνος** ἔχῃ **με**,
οἴχῃ **δ' εὐθ**ὺς ἰο**ῖσ' ὄκκα γλυκὺς ὕπνος** ἀνῇ **με**,

or in *Idyll* 6, where the dog looks out to the sea from which Galatea is soon to rise:

Id. 6.11 'ΕΙΣ **ἅλ**α **δερχομένα, τὰ δέ** νιν **καλ**ὰ κύματα φαίνει
14 'ΕΞ **ἀλ**ὸς **ἐρχομένας**, **κατὰ δὲ** χρόα **καλ**ὸν ἀμύξῃ.

The pattern may also be rhetorical, emphasizing a double question:

Id. 7.149 **ἆρά γέ πα τοιόν**δε Φόλω κατὰ λάινον ἄντρον
κρατῆρ' Ἡρακλῆι γέρων ἐστάσατο Χίρων;
ἆρά γέ πα τῆνον τὸν ποιμένα τὸν ποτ' Ἀνάπῳ,
τὸν κρατερὸν Πολύφαμον, ὃς ὤρεσι νᾶας ἔβαλλε,

---

quite attractive, for it has *nine* stanzas with *nine* refrains, which would be very appropriate to the magic context of the *Pharmaceutria*. For another example of strict numerical correspondence see *Eclogue* 5, where the songs of Mopsus (20-44) and Menalcas (56-80) about the death and apotheosis of Daphnis are each 25 lines long. In the Theocritean corpus there are several examples of such correspondence (*Id.* 8.63-70 ~ 72-80, *Id.* 9.7-13 ~ 15-21, *Id.* 10.24-37 ~ 42-55), though none are long enough to define the structure of a poem as they do in Vergil. Symmetries and antitheses are of course very much part of the architecture of the *Eclogues* (cf. Pöschl 1964: 67-83, 150-52). The elaborate structural patterns discovered by Maury (1944) have met with the full approval of relatively few scholars (e.g. Perret 1952: 14-22), but aspects of Maury's design have influenced later views of the book's structure (cf. Becker 1955; Otis 1964: 97-143; Skutsch 1969; Van Sickle 1967, 1978: 20-37). For criticism of architectural theories see G. Williams (1968: 328) and Rudd (1976: 119-44).

yet symmetry is also imposed on heterogeneous contexts, which suggests that what determines thought and sentence structure is not contextual parallelism, but the striving for symmetry itself:

Id. 8.28 **χοὶ μὲν παῖδες** ἄϋσαν, **ὁ δ' αἰπόλος** ἦνθ' ὑπακούσας·
χοὶ μὲν παῖδες ἀείδεν, **ὁ δ' αἰπόλος** ἤθελε κρίνειν.

Id. 9.15 Αἴτνα μᾶτερ ἐμά, κἠγὼ καλὸν ἄντρον ἐνοικέω
κοίλαις ἐν πέτραισιν· /**ἔχω δέ τοι ὅσσ'** ἐν ὀνείρῳ
φαίνονται, **πολλὰς** μὲν ὄϊς, **πολλὰς** δὲ χιμαίρας,
ὧν μοι **πρὸς** κεφαλᾷ καὶ **πρὸς** ποσὶ κώεα κεῖται.
ἐν πυρὶ δὲ δρυΐνῳ χόρια ζεῖ, **ἐν πυρὶ δ'** αὖαι
φαγοὶ χειμαίνοντος· /**ἔχω δέ τοι** οὐδ' **ὅσον** ὥραν
χείματος ἢ νωδὸς καρύων ἀμύλοιο παρόντος.

The fact that these two examples come from the spurious poems may be significant. In Theocritus symmetry tends to be functional; his imitators pursue it for its own sake, presumably because it had come to be viewed as a characteristic of the genre.[51] Vergil exploits symmetry for a variety of effects, but occasionally also tempers it through variation in word order and metrical position. Of the examples which occur outside the amoebaean and refrain poems few are as striking as the intricate chiastic pattern of the riddle in *E* 8.48-50. There are, however, several emphatic repetitions of names and phrases:

E 4.58 *Pan etiam, Arcadia* mecum *si iudice* certet,
Pan etiam Arcadia dicat *se iudice* victum.

E 6.29 *nec tantum* Phoebo gaudet Parnasia rupes,
nec tantum Rhodope miratur et Ismarus Orphea.

E 10.37 *certe* sive *mihi Phyllis* sive ess*et Amyntas*,
.41 *serta mihi Phyllis* legeret, cantar*et Amyntas*.

Sometimes Vergil employs fairly economical means:

E 4.50 *aspice* convex*o* nu*tant*em pondere mUNDUM,
terrasque tractusque maris caelumque profUNDUM;
aspice, ventur*o* lae*tent*ur ut *o*mnia saeclo.

The anaphora at verse beginning lends rhetorical emphasis, and the sound echoes, the rime, and the similar rhythm all create a feeling of symmetry, even though Vergil varies the grammatical structure of the two sentences, making *aspice* first govern a direct object and then an *ut*-clause. Such tension between symmetry and variation may be observed elsewhere:

E 2.8 *nunc etiam* pecu*des* umbras et frigora captant,
nunc viri*des etiam* occultant spineta lacertos.

[51] Cf. Van Sickle (1975: 21-22).

E 9.64 *cantantes* licet usque (minus via laedet) *eamus*;
cantantes ut *eamus*, ego hoc te fasce levabo.

The striving for variety evident in these examples makes more extensive symmetry all the more remarkable. Neither accident, nor metrical necessity, nor rhetorical emphasis suffices to explain such symmetry. It rather illustrates the strength of the particular generic patterns which foster symmetrical patterns of thought.

We must briefly return to the refrain and consider its very structure, which in itself may have contributed to symmetry, repetition, and *epanalepsis*. The refrains in pastoral poetry often emphasize the symmetry of hemistichs through repetition and leonine rime:

Id. 1.64 etc. **ἄρχετε** βουκολικᾶς,/ Μοῖσαι φίλαι,/ **ἄρχετ'** ἀοιδᾶς.
Id. 1.94 etc. **ἄρχετε** βουκολικᾶς,/ Μοῖσαι, πάλιν **ἄρχετ'** ἀοιδᾶς.
Id. 1.127 etc. **λήγετε** βουκολικᾶς,/ Μοῖσαι, ἴτε **λήγετ'** ἀοιδᾶς.
Ep. Bion. 8 etc. **ἄρχετε** Σικελικαί,/ τῶ πένθεος **ἄρχετε**, Μοῖσαι.

The symmetry and rime presumably derive from Homeric and Hesiodic invocations to the Muses (e.g. *Il.* 2.484; *Th.* 25, 114; *Op.* 1-2), but what also seems to characterize the refrain is the repetition of the initial imperative in the second part of the verse.[52] If such *conduplicatio* does not come from the oral tradition, it must at least represent what Hellenistic poets thought a refrain ought to be, for the pattern becomes fairly fixed, recurring in Catullus:

64.327 etc. *currite* ducentes subtegmina,/*currite*, fusi,

and in several Vergilian refrains:

E 8.61 *desine* Maenalios, /iam *desine*, /tibia, versus.
E 8.68 etc. *ducite* ab urbe domum, /mea carmina, /*ducite* Daphnin.
E 8.109 *parcite*, ab urbe venit, /iam *parcite*, /carmina, Daphnis.

The same pattern occurs in other lines of Theocritus and Vergil:

Id. 1.12 **λῇς** ποτὶ τᾶν Νυμφᾶν,/ **λῇς**, αἰπόλε,/ τεῖδε καθίξας,
Id. 1.15 **οὐ θέμις**, ὦ ποιμήν,/ τὸ μεσαμβρινὸν **οὐ θέμις** ἄμμιν
Id. 1.66 **πᾷ ποκ' ἄρ'** ἦσθ', ὅκα Δάφνις ἐτάκετο,/ **πᾷ ποκα**, Νύμφαι;
Id. 2.118 **ἦνθον** γάρ κεν ἐγώ,/ ναὶ τὸν γλυκὺν **ἦνθον** Ἔρωτα,

E 1.74 *ite* meae, felix quondam pecus,/ *ite* capellae.
E 4.11 *te*que adeo decus hoc aevi, *te* consule, inibit,
E 6.25 *carmina* quae *vultis*/cognoscite;/ *carmina vobis*,
E 7.44 *ite* domum past*i*,/ si quis pudor,/ *ite* iuvenc*i*.
E 10.77 *ite* domum satur*ae*,/ venit Hesperus,/ *ite* capell*ae*.

[52] See Wormell (1969: 25 n11); E. A. Schmidt (1972: 66, 71-72).

The iteration serves no grammatical purpose, for it merely emphasizes the pathos or urgency of the phrase, but its pattern seems to provide a model for many instances of anaphora in the same verse:

Id. 1.67	**ἢ κατά Πη**νειῶ καλὰ τέμπεα, /**ἢ κατὰ Πίν**δω;
Id. 2.165	**χαῖρε**, Σε**λα**ναία λιπαρόθρονε, /**χαίρε**τε δ' **ἄ**λλοι
Id. 4.31	**κεῦ** μὲν **τὰ** Γλαύκας ἀγκρούομαι, /**εὖ** δὲ **τὰ** Πύρρω.
Id. 5.104	**ἔστι δέ** μοι γαυλὸς κυπαρίσσινος, /**ἔστι δὲ** κρατήρ,
E 1.38	*Tity*rus h*i*nc aberat. /ipsae te, /*Tity*re, p*i*nus
E 9.17	*heu*, cadit in quemquam tantum scelus? /*heu*, tua nobis
E 10.11	*nam neque P*arnasi vobis iuga, /*nam neque P*indi...

While these repetitions serve a different grammatical function, they retain much of the refrain's lilting cadence. This pattern may be a characteristic of the genre, for the frequency with which the first word recurs in the latter part of the verse is much higher in pastoral poetry than in the *Georgics* or the *Aeneid.*[53] Some of these repetitions coincide with the middle of the verse, but more come after the hephthemimeral caesura or the bucolic diaeresis.[54] Thus while some may be used to articulate the symmetry of hemistichs, this is not the pattern's only function, for in Theocritus the repeated word in almost half the cases occurs after the bucolic diaeresis, where it is not particularly well suited to emphasize symmetry.[55] One obvious explanation is that in Theocritus the bucolic diaeresis often coincides with a rhetorical break, and that this has affected the use of anaphora within the individual verses.[56] But the process may in fact have been the

[53] Anaphora of the initial word within the same hexameter:

Idylls 1-11 (1042 lines) . . 74...every 14.1 lines/ 7.1%
Eclogues (830) . . . . 64...every 13.0 lines/ 7.7%
Georgic 1 (514). . . . . 17...every 30.2 lines/ 3.3%
Aeneid 1 (756) . . . . 23...every 32.9 lines/ 3.0%

[54] In addition to the examples already cited there are the following: after the penthemimeral caesura in *Id.* 1.69, 71, 101, 141, *Id.* 2.16, *Id.* 5.38, *Id.* 6.17, *Id.* 8.53, 63, *Id.* 10.28, *Id.* 11.46, 60, *E* 1.39, *E* 2.16, *E* 7.5, *E* 9.16, 19, *E* 10.42; after the third-foot diaeresis in *Id.* 1.65, *Id.* 5.60, *Id.* 11.63, *E* 1.62, *E* 5.35, *E* 6.59; after the hephthemimeral caesura in *Id.* 1.74, *Id.* 2.108, *Id.* 8.79, *Id.* 9.14, *E* 1.32, *E* 2.20, *E* 3.59, *E* 4.32, *E* 5.11, 33, 44, 76, 77, *E* 6.79, *E* 7.49, *E* 8.46, *E* 9.40, *E* 10.19, 29, 30; after the bucolic diaeresis in *Id.* 1.93, *Id.* 2.1, 23, 44, 49, *Id.* 5.14, 26, *Id.* 6.5, 10, *Id.* 7.105, *Id.* 8.3, 4, 76, *Id.* 9.7, 8, 19, 34, *Ep. Bion.* 17, 109, *E* 5.32, 46, *E* 7.63, *E* 8.34, 84, *E* 10.3.

[55] Anaphora of the initial word after the bucolic diaeresis within the same hexameter:

Idylls 1-11 (1042 lines) . . 35...every 29.8 lines/ 3.4% (47.3% of all anaphora—74)
Eclogues (830) . . . . 13...every 63.8 lines/ 1.6% (20.3% of 64)
Georgic 1 (514). . . . . 3...every 171.3 lines/ .6% (17.6% of 17)
Aeneid 1 (756) . . . . 2...every 378.0 lines/ .3% (8.7% of 23)

[56] The relatively high frequency of bucolic diaeresis in pastoral is well known since antiquity (Probus, Donatus, Servius in Wendel 1914: 15, 18, 21). See also Winbolt (1903: 45-48), W. R. Hardie (1920: 15-17), Maas (1962: 94-95), Van Sickle (1975: 12-13; 1978: 106-108). According to my own computation the diaeresis is stressed through punctuation in

reverse, for the frequency of the bucolic diaeresis in Theocritus is not easily explained as the result of something conceived in the abstract. More likely it was suggested by a pattern that was already at hand. The refrain, because of its relatively fixed form and high frequency, would have provided a suitable model, for the bucolic diaeresis emphasized either through a rhetorical break, *conduplicatio*, or both, seems to be a common feature of refrains.[57]

More importantly, the refrain pattern gives rise to a set of figures which may loosely be grouped under the term *epanalepsis.*[58] The refrain largely derives its melodiousness from the repeated imperative (*conduplicatio*), which by lingering on the emphatic word gives the line emotional intensity. It is part of what one might call the 'pathetic style'. The effect is particularly strong when the repeated word coincides with the bucolic diaeresis, for then it becomes part of a closing cadence, a poetic clausula. This 'pathetic' effect of the refrain is then extended by analogy through the repetition of words and phrases over two or more lines so as to result in *epanalepsis* (e.g. *Id.* 1.29-30, 95-96, 144-45; *Id.* 3.3-4; *Id.* 7.57-59; *Id.* 9.1-2). Vergil develops this figure further, for the repeated word usually serves as the starting point for emphasizing, correcting, or developing the original thought (e.g. *E* 4.24-25, *E* 9.27-28, *E* 8.56-57, *E* 6.20-21,

22.8% of the verses in *Idylls* 1-7 and in 8.7% of the verses in the *Eclogues*, as opposed to 2.3% in *Georgic* 1, 1.6% in *Aeneid* 1, 1.4% in Lucretius 1, 1.9% in Cicero's *Aratea*. Prof. A. T. Cole has suggested to me that the bucolic diaeresis may have been used by Theocritus, and to a lesser degree by the other Alexandrians (e.g. Call., *Hymns*—16.0%, Ap. Rhod. *Arg.* 1—17.8%), to separate the hexameter into two distinct metrical units (dactylic tetrameter and adonic) so as to lend the verse a more lyric quality (on admixture of lyric in Alexandrian poetry cf. also Rossi 1971: 85). Patzer (1955) finds a similar lyric effect in the tendency of the neoteric hexameter to stress the penthemimeral caesura through symmetrical separation of nouns and adjectives, thus dividing the verse into two cola (cf. also Worstbrock 1963: 159-62). Homer (*Il.* 1—11.0%, *Od.* 1—10.6%) and Hesiod (*Op.*—11.5%, *Th.*—8.1%) give us some idea of how frequent bucolic diaeresis might be in a less self-conscious poet. Aratus (7.9%) seems to follow their lead in this respect. The Latin hexameter, being subject to different linguistic constraints, has a lower incidence of bucolic diaeresis, though the difference between pastoral and the other genres is much greater than in the Greek tradition. For a fuller discussion of bucolic verse see E. A. Schmidt (1972: 38-45).

[57] The refrains examined above all fall into this category, and the bucolic diaeresis also occurs in the refrain of *Id.* 2.69 etc. Since many refrains take the form of invocations, it seems appropriate to look at their form as well. Here too we find the bucolic diaeresis quite frequently: e.g. Hes. *Th.* 36, 1021; *Hymn. Hom.* 2.1, 54, 6.19, 7.58, 10.1, 12.1, 13.1, 3, 17.1, 18.1, 12, 20.1, 22.1, 6, 28.1, 30.1; Theognis 1, 11, 15; Theocr. *Id.* 9.28; Call. *Hymn.* 3.110, 259, 4.109, 226, 325.

[58] For a discussion of the various repetitive figures related to *epanalepsis* see Lausberg (1960: 310-18). Cf. also Gimm (1910: 87-94); Norden on 6.164, 495; Austin on 6.164; G. Williams (1968: 705, 719, 730).

E 8.77-78, *E* 10.72-73). In one instance two forms of *epanalepsis* are intertwined, thereby heightening even further the pathos of the passage:

E 6.55 *claudite*, *Nymphae*,
Dictaeae *Nymphae*, nemorum iam *claudite* saltus.

Elsewhere a phrase returns in chiastic order so as to frame the whole sentence:

E 1.27 libertas, quae sera *tamen respexit* inertem,
candidior postquam tondenti barba cadebat,
respexit tamen et longo post tempore venit.

Such framing repetition is quite common in the *Eclogues*,[59] where it gradually develops into a structural element resembling both ring-composition and the refrain:

E 8.1 Pastorum *Musam Damonis et Alphesiboei*,
immemor herbarum quos est mirata iuvenca
certantis, quorum stupefactae carmine lynces,
et mutata suos requierunt flumina cursus,
Damonis Musam dicemus *et Alphesiboei*.

The repeated phrase, though still retaining the pathos of *epanalepsis*, functions very much like a refrain, punctuating and rounding out paragraphs.[60]

Our inquiry into the origin and evolution of the bucolic style has yielded a few insights that make the quantitative differences between it and other types of poetry more intelligible. Gimm had correctly recognized the genre's preference for parallel structures; and the high frequency of *homoeokatarkton*, *homoeoteleuton*, and repetition would seem to be a natural consequence of such preference. Yet symmetry and parallelism are not mere ornaments designed to lend the poems a bucolic air, but rather manifestations of the forces that helped to shape the genre. In the *Eclogues* these forces have made themselves felt in several ways, for the elements identified with pastoral have served both as concrete models for literary imitation and as generic patterns influencing composition on the subconscious level. Since this process was rooted in the tradition of pastoral

[59] For the most part framing words or phrases occur at the beginnings of verses: /*incipe*.... /*incipe* (*E* 5.10-13),/*huc ades*.... /*huc ades* (*E* 10.39-43), /*incipe, parve puer*.... /*incipe, parve puer* (*E* 4.60-62), /*fortunate senex*.... /*fortunate senex* (*E* 1.46-51), /*a, virgo infelix*.... /*a, virgo infelix* (*E* 6.47-52). This appears to be a Vergilian development, for while Theocritus has a few frames (e.g. *Id.* 10.26 ~ 36, *Id.* 7.52 ~ 61, *Id.* 2.21 ~ 62, *Id.* 4.1 ~ 58), they span longer passages and have little in common with *epanalepsis*.

[60] Poteat (1912: 19-20) calls some of the longer framing repetitions "partial refrains." For a somewhat different analysis of the repetitional devices (including framing and *epanalepsis*) in the *Eclogues* see Offermann (1975).

poetry, the various forms of symmetry and repetition have envolved in conformity with that genre. But if we accept the singularity of the repetitions in the *Eclogues*, we should not assume, as Sparrow (p. 79) did, that observations about Vergil's practice in one work are applicable to another, for in a different generic and stylistic tradition the factors governing repetition will also be different.

III. REPETITION AND THE EPIC GENRE

A. *The Tradition*

It is difficult to estimate precisely how Roman epic poets have influenced Vergil's use of repetition. Whatever remains of Livius Andronicus and Naevius is much too fragmentary, and although the *Annales* of Ennius have fared somewhat better, we can only speculate about the role repetition may have played there.[61] But we can be reasonably sure that repetition was not uncommon. Elements related to repetition abound: leonine rime (*Ann.* 87, 88, 109, 270, 307, 309, 327, 377, 378, 395, 404, 480, 521, 556), *homoeokatarkton* (*Ann.* 94-96, 236-38, 240-41, 401-404, 444-45), *homoeoteleuton* (*Ann.* 41-44, 36-38, 237-40, 239-42, 241-43, 404-407, 519-20), and alliteration (e.g. *Ann.* 109, 207, 340, 359, 621).[62] On occasion there is some parallelism between consecutive verses:

Ann. 183 proletarius publicitus scutis*que feroque*[63]
ornatur ferro, muros urbem*que forumque*
excubiis curant

Ann. 187 in*cedunt* arbusta per alta, securibus caedunt,
per*cellunt* magnas quercus, exciditur ilex,

Ann. 240 *e*lo*quere*tur et cuncta malaque et bona dictu
*e*vo*meret* si qui vellet tutoque locaret,

Ann. 268 *pe*ll*itur* e medio sapientia, vi geritur res,
s*pe*rn*itur* orator bonus, horridus miles amatur.

Such parallelism, however, is not so conspicuous as the frequent wordplays and experimentations with sound:

Ann. 252 *alter nare* cupit: *alter* pug*nare* paratust.

Ann. 265 Poeni sti*pend*ia *pend*unt

[61] Ancient commentators are of little help here, while speculation on the basis of the fragments is hazardous, because often they derive from writers who had no access to the text itself, but were excerpting summaries of earlier treatises (see Jocelyn 1964, 1965).

[62] The numbering of the fragments is Vahlen's.

[63] The *-que... -que* doublet imitates the Homeric -τε... -τε. See Fraenkel (1960: 199-201), Ross (1969: 63-67); also Norden (on 6.336), Pease (on 4.83), Austin (on 4.83), Williams (on 5.92), Eden (on 8.94), Fordyce (on 7.186).

Ann. 270 haut *doctis dictis* certantes nec male*dictis*
Ann. 273 *rem repetunt* regnumque *petunt*, vad*unt* solida vi.
Ann. 359 *nec cum capta capi nec cum com*busta cremari
Ann. 431 *si* luci, *si* nox, *si* mox, *si* iam data *sit* frux.

He also seems to have experimented with repetition, for even our fragmentary remains contain several examples:[64]

Ann. 29 qui *caelum* versat *stellis fulgentibus aptum*
Ann. 159 *caelum* suspexit *stellis fulgentibus aptum*
Ann. 339 hinc Nox processit *stellis* ardentibus *apta*.

Ann. 102 cum superum lumen *nox intempesta* teneret
Ann. 167 bellum aequis manibus *nox intempesta* diremit.

Ann. 114 tu produxisti nos *in*tra *luminis oras*.
Ann. 131 at sese, sum quae dederat *in luminis oras*

Ann. 161 Romani scalis: *summa nituntur opum vi.*
Ann. 412 aedificant nomen: *summa nituntur opum vi.*

Ann. 224 explorant Numidae totum: *quatit ungula terram*
Ann. 277 consequitur. summo sonitu *quatit ungula terram.*
Ann. 439 it eques et plausu cava concutit *ungula terram.*

Ann. 386 *labitur uncta carina*, volat super impetus undas
Ann. 478 *labitur uncta carina* per aequora cana celocis.

There are some instances of variation:

Ann. 175 tum cum corde suo *divum pater* atque *hominum rex*
Ann. 580 *divumque hominum*que *pater rex*,

although these metrically identical hemistichs may have been formulaic in their own right.[65] The word order of both is much more stylized than Homer's πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε (but cf. *Ann.* 581), which suggests experimentation rather than mere avoidance of repetition. Thus on the basis of internal evidence alone it is likely that repetition was a standard feature of Ennius' epic style. For this Homer would have provided the obvious model, which Ennius as *alter Homerus* could hardly have disregarded. The dream at the beginning of his poem is a mandate to write a Homeric epic, and by virtue of its contrast with Callimachus' dream in the *Aitia* it signals a rejection of Callimachean poetics.[66] What we cannot tell from the

[64] For a fuller list of Ennian repetitions (including some shorter phrases) see Ingalls (1971: 235-36).

[65] Cf. Vahlen (1928: 107): *et haud dubie Ennius saepius in annalibus Iovem hunc in modum similemve appellavit*; also Wigodsky (1972: 50-51).

[66] Cf. Skutsch (1968: 7-9), Clausen (1964: 185-86). In turn, Vergil's dependence on Ennius was also inevitable. "Ein heroisches Epos war nur in homerischem Vers und Stil denkbar, und ein homerischer Stil in lateinischer Sprache nicht ohne Anknüpfung an

fragments is how Ennius used repetition, whether it was strictly decorative or embraced other functions as well.[67]

The loss of Ennius is partly offset by the survival of Lucretius, who extols Ennius' poetic achievement (1.117-19) and imitates his language.[68] Repetitions are plentiful in the *De Rerum Natura*, and unless they represent a purely Lucretian phenomenon, their frequency should be further evidence of their importance in Ennius, if not the whole Latin epic tradition. A comparison with Vergil's *Aeneid* is instructive:[69]

REPETITIONS	*De Rerum Natura* (7400)	*Aeneid* (9896)
5-12 elements	15.4% / every 6.5 lines	18.2% / every 5.5 lines
10-12 elements	5.9% / every 16.9 lines	1.8% / every 54.4 lines
5- 9 elements	9.4% / every 10.6 lines	16.4% / every 6.1 lines

If Lucretius adequately reflects the Ennian tradition, the overall texture of repetition in the *Aeneid* would appear to conform with that tradition. Closer examination, however, reveals some differences, for Lucretius employs longer repetitions more often than Vergil, but is more sparing with shorter ones.[70] The reasons for this could be stylistic or contextual. Vergil's avoidance of longer repetitions might be construed as a reaction to a perceived excess in earlier poetry, but it could also be due to the different functions of repetition in the two poems.

This is where the usefulness of Lucretius as a guide to the tradition begins to diminish. He is an anomaly in early Latin literature for although he admires Ennius and employs his language, in his pursuit of truth (*verae rationis*) he renounces the gods and fictions of the epic universe and the vanities of human ambition. His poem's didactic content and polemical tone distinguish it from the Homeric-Ennian tradition of which Vergil was the heir. The language of Lucretius was influential, as was that of all hexameter poets, but the use of language in epic and didactic poetry had to be

Ennius" (Heinze 1915: 249; cf. also Kroll 1924: 150-51). On the importance of Ennius for the development of a Latin poetic language see Leumann (1947); for his style see G. Williams (1968: 684-99).

[67] Ennian influences on Vergil's language will be discussed only where they help in understanding Vergilian repetition. Particularly useful in assessing Vergil's debt to Ennius are Regel (1907), Norden (1915 and 1927: 365-72), O. Skutsch (1968), Wigodsky (1972).

[68] See Merrill (1918: 249-64). On Lucretius' style see G. Williams (1968: 716-22).

[69] The figures for Lucretius are based on the Appendices of Minyard (1978).

[70] Even more striking is the difference in exact verse repetition: Lucretius 5.0% (every 19.9 lines), *Aeneid* 1.0% (every 97.0 lines).

different by virtue of different emphasis. Lucretius may well have imitated Ennian phrases and repetitions, but he adapted them to his own purposes; and Vergil did the same with Lucretius.

Yet Lucretius' repetitional technique, different though it was, could hardly have passed unnoticed by Vergil. The problem is that statistical observations are easy to make and give us a rough idea of the poem's surface, but understanding a poet's technique calls for interpretation. Here for a long time progress was blocked by the discomfort scholars felt with Lucretian (as with Vergilian) repetition and with the poem's unfinished state. Until this century they have tended to suspect many repetitions of being interpolations and several dissertations have been devoted to this problem.[71] The work of C. Lenz differed from these in that it accepted most repetitions as genuine, but it focused primarily on questions of priority, not on poetic technique or the function of repetition. It is only with the much-cited dissertation of Deutsch (1939) that the issue was beginning to be addressed, although Deutsch placed the main emphasis on alliterative patterns, rime, and theme words, rather than longer repetitions. Nevertheless, her finding that the poem presents an elaborate pattern of sound whose function is both poetic and didactic explained Lucretian repetitions for the first time as rooted in art and not negligence or fraud.[72] Friedländer (1941) developed more fully Deutsch's idea of harmony between language and thought, pointing out that Lucretius repeatedly emphasizes the analogy between letters, which can form a multiplicity of words, and atoms, which produce the universe (e.g. 1.196-98, 823-26, 907-14; 2.686-99, 1013-21), so that the puns, etymologies, and associations of similar sounds are essentially illustrations of the atomic theory. One could presumably extend this to the whole 'pattern of sound', for like the letters of the alphabet the repeated phrases and lines recombine to form new units of sense. These and other types of didactic repetition are conveniently summarized by Bailey in the introduction to his Lucretius commentary.[73] The didactic function of some repeti-

[71] E.g. F. Neumann, *De interpolationibus Lucretianis* (Halle, 1875) and C. Gneisse, *De versibus in Lucreti carmine repetitis* (Strassburg, 1878), cited by C. Lenz (1937: 6).

[72] "The language of Lucretius is in perfect harmony with his thought. His repetition of similar sounds in various ways is completely analogous to the reiteration of his universal principles. The scope of his sound-pattern is just as broad as the compass of his philosophy" (Deutsch 1939: 176; cf. also 172).

[73] See Bailey (1947: I.144-65), who finds that repetitions serve to hammer home a concept, to emphasize axioms of his theory, to mark the introduction of a new subject, and as an elaborate form of referring the reader to earlier discussions of the same topic. Maguinness (1965: 73-74) suggests that the need for clarity caused Lucretius to prefer exact repetition over variation.

tions in Lucretius is not surprising, though the forms it takes seem to be determined by his particular requirements rather than traditional didactic usage. Needless to say, it is a special function of very limited use in a poem such as the *Aeneid*.

The most recent work on Lucretian repetition has been concerned primarily with its formulaic aspect, which reflects the influence of current Homeric scholarship.[74] All language is to some extent formulaic, and it is important for better understanding of the difference between written and oral styles to learn more about the functioning of such formulae within a literary tradition. But such analysis of formulaic systems tends to deal more with processes shared by many writers than with individual peculiarities of style, for it pertains above all to the mechanics of composition in hexameter verse and not to matters of poetic imagination and stylistic choice.

The role of repetition as a poetic device has received only occasional attention. Elder (1954) tried to show that repetition often results from subconscious association and thus can reveal much "about the poet's thoughts and feelings in a particular passage" (p. 94). Commager (1957) in a discussion of Lucretius' account of the plague found a similar associative technique at work in the poet's tendency to see "physical phenomena in moral and psychological terms" (p. 105).[75] M. F. Smith (1966) restated more strongly what had already been adumbrated by Deutsch, namely that Lucretian repetition serves both didactic and poetic ends, driving home important points[76] and linking certain situations or ideas.[77] Whether

[74] Ingalls (1971) thinks that apart from reasons of style and didactic effectiveness the repetitions were adopted because they also helped Lucretius to compose. In support of this he cites the numerous complaints about the poverty of Latin and the apparent difficulty of finding suitable equivalents for complicated Greek technical terms. Consequently the repetition of terms like *primordia rerum* would be encouraged by the context and by their convenient metrical shape, while their relative metrical stability within the hexameter would foster the development of longer repetitive patterns. Minyard (1978) presents a detailed analysis of Lucretian formulae, showing how the whole system evolved from metrically stable words and from the contraction or expansion of basic formulae. The formulaic flexibility seems comparable to what has been observed in Homer, although Minyard finds Lucretius' system different from that of Homer, because Lucretius had to construct his formulaic style "without the aid of an inherited tradition" (p. 99). This is an exaggeration, for surely the Ennian tradition provided a pattern, if not the actual material for such a style.

[75] Elder (1954: 94) considered such association instinctive rather than conscious, as did Commager, who contrasted it with Vergil's deliberate attempts to link Aeneas with Augustus through similar phraseology (cf. 1957: 111). This distinction between Lucretian and Vergilian practice seems forced, because deliberate and spontaneous repetition may be found in both poets.

[76] Smith (1966: 77-78) calls attention to the fact that the writings of Epicurus may have been quite repetitious (see Diog. Laert. 10.7).

[77] Note for instance the parallelism of 2.29-33 and 5.1392-96, where according to Smith

these associations are conscious or not, the identification of such 'thought-links' is important, for it enables us to see more clearly the inner logic and poetic coherence of the work. Thus the main value of what Elder, Commager, and Smith have done lies in the recognition that associative repetition plays an important role in the poetry of Lucretius, one that Vergil could have observed and adapted for his own use.

With Greek epic we are on firmer ground, for we have both Homeric poems and the *Argonautica* of Apollonius. Stylistically these works are poles apart. The repetitive nature of Homer's poetry needs no demonstration.[78] Apollonius, on the other hand, has few repeated verses, and of these almost half occur in related passages and are probably deliberate.[79] Most of them are speeches reported directly or indirectly, as for example the invitation of Hypsipyle repeated by Iphinoe:

Arg. 1.704 ἡμέτερόνδε μολεῖν **ὅστις** στόλου ἡγεμονεύει,
ὄφρα τί οἱ δήμοιο ἔπος θυμηδὲς ἐνίσπω·
καὶ δ' αὐτοὺς γαίης τε καὶ ἄστεος, αἴ κ' ἐθέλωσι,
κέκλεο θαρσαλέως **ἐπιβαινέμεν εὐμενέοντας.**

Arg. 1.713 Ὑψιπύλη καλέειν νηὸς πρόμον **ὅστις** ὄρωρεν,
ὄφρα τί οἱ δήμοιο ἔπος θυμηδὲς ἐνίσπη·
καὶ δ' αὐτοὺς γαίης τε καὶ ἄστεος, αἴ κ' ἐθέλητε,
κέκλεται αὐτίκα νῦν **ἐπιβαινέμεν εὐμενέοντας.**

Similarly the words of Aeetes describing the bronze-footed bulls are echoed by Jason when he reports back to the Argonauts:

Arg. 3.409 **δοιώ** μοι **πεδίον τὸ 'Αρήιον ἀμφινέμ**ονται
ταύρω χαλκόποδε, στόματι φλόγα φυσιόωντε.

Arg. 3.495 φῆ δὲ **δύω πεδίον τὸ 'Αρήιον ἀμφινέμ**εσθαι
ταύρω χαλκόποδε, στόματι φλόγα φυσιόωντε.

Hypsipyle in her speech to Jason about the murder of the Lemnians recalls Apollonius' own account of that story at the beginning of the Lemnian episode:

(p. 79) the "purpose of the repetition is to identify what modern man ought to be doing and what early man did," or the echoes between 3.1-30 and the invocation to Venus, which suggest that she and Epicurus produce analogous responses in nature and man respectively (cf. Smith 80-81).

[78] C. E. Schmidt (1885: viii) estimates that if one were to add all the repetitions of complete verses (1804 verses repeated 4730 times), verses with slight variation (2118 verses repeated 5612 times), and recurring parts of verses, one would find about 16,000 verses of the Homeric corpus composed of repetitions.

[79] A useful discussion in Elderkin (1913); also good, Fränkel (1968: 98 n188, 324) on repetition and variation. That variation is a dominant stylistic principle of Hellenistic poetry has been shown by Deubner (1921).

Arg. 1.611 **δὴ γὰρ κουριδίας μὲν ἀπ**ηνήν**αντο γυναῖκας**
ἀνέρες ἐχθήραντες, ἔχον δ' ἐπὶ **ληιάδεσσι**
τρηχὺν ἔρον,

Arg. 1.804 **δὴ γὰρ κουριδίας μὲν ἀπ**έστυγον ἔκ τε μελάθρων
ᾗ ματίῃ εἴξαντες **ἀπ**εσσεύ**οντο γυναῖκας**,
αὐτὰρ **ληιάδεσσι** δοριχτήταις παρίαυον,
σχέτλιοι.

Arete conveying the decision of Alcinoos to Jason repeats the most important elements of her husband's speech:

Arg. 4.1106 **παρθενικὴν μὲν ἐοῦσαν**, ἑῷ ἀπὸ **πατρὶ** κομίσσαι
ἰθυνέω· **λέκτρον δὲ σὺν ἀνέρι πορσαίνουσαν**,
οὔ μιν ἑοῦ πόσιος νοσφίσσομαι,

Arg. 4.1118 **παρθενικὴν μὲν ἐοῦσαν**, ἑοῦ ποτὶ δώματα **πατρός**
ἐκδώσειν· **λέκτρον δὲ σὺν ἀνέρι πορσαίνουσαν**,
οὐκέτι κουριδίης μιν ἀποτμήξειν φιλότητος.

Finally, the instructions of the Libyan nymphs are accurately repeated by Jason to his comrades:

Arg. 4.1323 **ἡρῶσσαι Λιβύης τιμήοροι ἠδὲ θύγατρες.**
ἀλλ' ἄνα, μηδ' ἔτι τοῖον οιζύων ἀκάχησο,
ἄνστησον δ' ἑτάρους· εὖτ' ἂν δέ τοι **'Αμφιτρίτη**
ἅρμα Ποσειδάωνος ἐύτροχον αὐτίκα **λύσῃ**,
δή ῥα τότε **σφετέρῃ** ἀπὸ **μητέρι** τίνετ' **ἀμοιβήν**
ὧν ἔκαμεν δηρὸν κατὰ νηδύος ὔμμε φέρουσα,

Arg. 4.1353 **μητέρι** δὲ **σφετέρῃ** μενοεικέα τεῖσαι **ἀμοιβήν**
ὧν ἔκαμεν δηρὸν κατὰ νηδύος ἄμμε φέρουσα,
ὁππότε κεν **λύσῃ**σιν **ἐύτροχον 'Αμφιτρίτη**
ἅρμα Ποσειδάωνος· ἐγὼ δ' οὐ πάγχυ νοῆσαι
τῆσδε θεοπροπίης ἴσχω πέρι. φάν γε μὲν εἶναι
ἡρῶσσαι Λιβύης τιμήοροι ἠδὲ θύγατρες·

Because Jason does not quite understand the meaning of what the nymphs had said, the repetition seems particularly appropriate.[80] In general, one may say that all these repetitions are effective because they give emphasis to significant events in the poem, and at the same time emulate the naive simplicity of oral epic. It should be noted, however, that these are exceptions to the general practice of Apollonius, and that even here he varies his lines a good deal more than Homer is apt to do.

We cannot say whether the other repetitions in Apollonius are intentional or accidental. Some seem curiously appropriate, such as the line from the prologue about the Argo's journey through the Clashing Rocks,

[80] See Fränkel (1968: 98 n188).

which is repeated in Book 4 to describe the arrival of the Colchians at Scheria. The heroic achievement of stopping the Clashing Rocks now works against the Argonauts by providing a passage for their pursuers:[81]

Arg. 1.2 μνήσομαι **οἳ Πόντοιο κατὰ στόμα καὶ διὰ πέτρας**
Κυανέας βασιλῆος ἐφημοσύνῃ Πελίαο

Arg. 4.1001 ὧδε μάλ' ἀγχίμολον στρατὸς ἄσπετος ἐξεφαάνθη
Κόλχων, **οἳ Πόντοιο κατὰ στόμα καὶ διὰ πέτρας**
Κυανέας μαστῆρες ἀριστήων ἐπέρησαν.

Perhaps less significant, though appropriate, is the repetition of the line describing the Argo's Dodonian oak beam, which in Book 4 speaks with human voice urging the Argonauts to seek purification for the murder of Absyrtus:

Arg. 4.582 αὐδῆεν γλαφυρῆς νηὸς **δόρυ, τό ῥ' ἀνὰ μέσσην**
στεῖραν 'Αθηναίη Δωδωνίδος ἥρμοσε φηγοῦ.

Arg. 1.526 ἐν γάρ οἱ **δόρυ** θεῖον ἐλήλατο, **τό ῥ' ἀνὰ μέσσην**
στεῖραν 'Αθηναίη Δωδωνίδος ἥρμοσε φηγοῦ.

Equally appropriate, but possibly fortuitous, is the recurrence of the same formula when Argus talks about his name and lineage to Jason and to Aeetes:

Arg. 2.1154 **εἰ δὲ καὶ οὔνομα δῆθεν ἐπιθύεις** δεδαῆσθαι,

Arg. 3.354 **εἰ δὲ καὶ οὔνομα δῆθεν ἐπιθύεις** γενεήν τε
ἴδμεναι.

There remain several formulaic expressions used to introduce or close speeches:

Arg. 1.1103 **ὧς φάτο, τῷ δ' ἀσπαστὸν ἔπος γένετ' εἰσαΐοντι·**
= *Arg.* 3.145

Arg. 1.717 **ὧς ἄρ' ἔφη, πάντεσσι δ'** ἐναίσιμος **ἥνδανε** μῦθος·
Arg. 2.1068 **ὧς ἄρ' ἔφη, πάντεσσι δ'** ἐπίρροθος **ἥνδανε** μῆτις.

Arg. 1.1336 **τὸν δ' αὖτ' Αἴσονος υἱὸς ἐπιφραδέως προσέειπεν·**
Arg. 2.885 **τὸν δ' αὖτ' Αἴσονος υἱὸς** ἀμηχανέων **προσέειπεν.**
Arg. 2.1134 **τὸν δ' αὖτ' Αἴσονος υἱὸς ἐπιφραδέως** ἐρέεινε,

Arg. 1.294 **μειλιχίοις ἐπέεσσι παρ**ηγορέων **προσέειπεν·**
Arg. 2.621 **μειλιχίοις ἐπέεσσι παρα**βλήδην **προσέειπεν·**
Arg. 4.394 **μειλιχίοις ἐπέεσσιν** ὑποδδείσας **προσέειπεν·**
Arg. 4.1317 **μειλιχίοις ἐπέεσσιν** ἀτυζόμενον **προσέειπον·**

While some of these repetitions are possibly accidental, in view of the many variations it is more likely that here Apollonius is experimenting

[81] See Fränkel (1968: 552).

with epic repetition. Though he may have thought Homer's repetitions excessive and inartistic, they were very much part of the genre, and he therefore may have chosen to suggest Homer's style through the judicious use of a few repeated lines and phrases.

The great number of repetitions in the *Aeneid* may lead one to conclude that Vergil was thoroughly Homeric in his practice, but the matter is not that simple. Although the repetitions are many, they are neither so indiscriminate nor so frequent as in Homer. Few verses recur more than once, and in general there is much variation. Vergil's repetitional style is rather the result of a creative interaction with the tradition. Homer provides the model for epic repetition, Apollonius for self-conscious restraint, and between them they make up the dominant tension in the style of the *Aeneid.*

B. *The Use of Formulae in the* Aeneid

Sparrow (pp. 83-88), trying to show that variation was the main stylistic principle in the *Aeneid*, examined how Vergil used two kinds of formulae: lines describing the beginning and the end of speeches occurring in Book 6, and lines describing the succession of day and night in the whole poem. On the basis of this material he decided "that Virgil, so far from imitating, actually did his best to avoid, Homeric repetition" (p. 87). The basic flaw of Sparrow's method derives from his failure to define what constitutes 'Homeric' or 'epic' repetition, terms which he seems to have used interchangeably. If what he meant is repetition on Homer's scale and frequency, then it is not a very useful observation, for no one has ever claimed that for Vergil. But if under 'epic' repetition he understood the use of repeated formulae in contexts where Homer is likely to have used a repetition, then his conclusion is contradicted by the very evidence he cited, for there are many such formulae in the descriptions of day and night.

1. *Speaking Formulae*

When we compare the examples from *Aeneid* 6 already listed by Sparrow (pp. 84-85) with similar formulae in *Arg.* 1 and *Odyssey* 11, the difference between the practice of Homer, and that of Apollonius and Vergil becomes quite clear. In the Odyssean *Nekuia* there are 41 cases where beginning or end of a speech is signalled; of these, 26 are repetitions of 5 or more elements—a substantially higher frequency of repetition than is found in Apollonius or Vergil, as can be seen from the following table:

BEGINNING OR END OF SPEECHES SIGNALLED

	Number of Signals	Number of Repetitions
Odyssey 11	41	26
Argonautica 1	53	9
Aeneid 6	48	8

The difference is in fact even more substantial, because 24 of the Homeric repetitions are full verses, whereas none of the Apollonian or Vergilian repetitions are that long:

Arg. 1.293 **αὐτὰρ ὁ τήνγε**
μειλιχίοις ἐπέεσσι **παρ**ηγορέων **προσέειπεν**·
Arg. 1.835 **...αὐτὰρ ὁ τήνγε παρα**βλήδην **προσέειπεν**·

Arg. 1.331 **τοῖσιν δ' Αἴσονος υἱὸς** εὐφρονέων μετ**έειπεν**·
Arg. 1.899 **τὴν δ' αὖτ' Αἴσονος υἱὸς** ἀγαιόμενος **προσέειπεν**·
Arg. 1.1336 **τὸν δ' αὖτ' Αἴσονος υἱὸς** ἐπιφραδέως **προσέειπεν**·

Arg. 1.343 ὁ δ' αὐτόθεν ἔνθα περ ἧστο
δεξιτερὴν ἀνὰ **χεῖρα** ταν**ύσσατο, φώνησέν τε.**
Arg. 1.1330 **χεῖρα** δε χειρί
ἄκρην ἀμφιβαλὼν προσπτ**ύξατο φώνησέν τε.**

Arg. 1.710 **ὦκα δὲ τούσγε**
πασσυδίῃ **μύθοισι προσέννεπεν** ἐξερέοντας·
Arg. 1.791 ἔμπα **δὲ τόνγε**
αἰδομένῃ **μύθοισι προσέννεπεν** αἱμυλίοισιν·

6.125 *cum sic orsa loqui vates*:
6.562 *tum vates sic orsa loqui*:

6.341 *sic prior ad*loqu*itur*
6.387 *sic prior ad*gred*itur* dictis atque increpat ultro:

6.538 sed comes admonuit breviterque *adfata Sibylla est*:
6.666 quos circumfusos sic *est adfata Sibylla*,

6.713 *tum pater Anchises*:
6.854 sic *pater Anchises* atque haec mirantibus addit:
6.867 *tum pater Anchises* lacrimis ingressus obortis:

Both Vergil and Apollonius take pains to vary these formulae within the individual books. A few longer repetitions occur between different books in Apollonius (see above, pp. 61-63) and Vergil:

2.775 = *tum sic adfari et curas his demere dictis*
3.153 = 8.35

4.219 *talibus or*antem *dictis arasque ten*entem
6.124 *talibus or*abat *dictis arasque ten*ebat,

1.406 agnov*it tali fugientem est voce secutus*:
9.17 sustul*it* ac *tali fugientem est voce secutus*:

10.556 provolvens *super haec inimico pectore fatur*:
11.685 traicit et *super haec inimico pectore fatur*:

4.304 tandem his Aenean *compellat vocibus ultro*:
6.499 supplicia, et notis *compellat vocibus ultro*:

4.197 incenditque animum *dictis atque aggerat iras*.
11.342 surgit et his onerat *dictis atque aggerat iras*:

6.506 constitui et *magna* manis *ter voce vocavi*.
10.873 atque hic Aenean *magna ter voce vocavit*.

Often we may see a line or phrase passing through a series of permutations, as for example the line from the *Georgics* describing Orpheus' vain attempts to grasp the vanishing shade of Eurydice:

G 4.501 prens*antem NEQUIQUAM* umbras *et multa volentem dicere* praeterea vidit;

2.790 haec ubi dicta dedit, lacrim*antem et multa volentem dicere* deseruit,

4.390 linquens multa metu CUNCT*antem et multa* PARA*ntem dicere*. [volentem *M*]

10.554 tum caput or*antis NEQUIQUAM et multa* PARA*ntis dicere* deturbat terrae,

7.449 lumina CUNCT*antem et* quaer*entem dicere* plura reppulit,

or the phrase *dictis adfatur*, around which many variations are built:

1.663 ergo HIS aligerum *dictis adfatur A*morem:
2.147 vincla iubet Priamus *dictis*que ita *fatur amicis*:
8.126 *tum* regem *Aeneas dictis adfatur amicis*:
10.466 *tum* genitor natum *dictis adfatur amicis*:
10.591 *QU*em pi*US Aeneas dictis adfatur* am*aris*:
5.41 excipit, ac fessos opibus *SOLatur amicis*.
5.770 *QU*os bon*US Aeneas dictis SOLatur amicis*
9.640 nube sedens, ATQUE HIS victorEM *adfatur* IULUM:
9.652 ATQUE HIS ardentEM *dictis adfatur* IULUM:

Shorter repetitions between the books are much more common.[82] In this

[82] /*Haec ubi dicta* (1.81, 5.32, 315, 8.175), /*haec ubi dicta dedit* (2.790, 6.628, 7.323, 471, 8.541, 10.633, 12.81, 441), /*talia voce refert* (1.94, 208), /*talia dicta dabat* (5.852, 9.431), /*talibus orabat* (4.437, 6.124, 10.96), /*vix ea fatus erat* (1.586, 2.692, 3.655, 6.190, 8.520, 12.650), /*vix ea fatus eram* (2.323, 3.90), /*tantum effatus, -a* (6.547, 10.877, 12.885), ...*dehinc talia fatur*/ (1.131, 256), ...*ac talia fatur*/ (3.485, 5.16, 79, 464, 532, 7.330, 8.559, 12.228), ...*atque ita fatur*/ (5.382, 10.480, 11.822, 12.295), ...*sic deinde locutus*/ (5.14, 303, 400), ...*sic*...*ore locuta*

respect Vergil is somewhat more tolerant of repetition than Apollonius, who (at least judging from a brief inspection of all the books) seems to favor even briefer formulaic expressions.[83]

All this would appear to vindicate Sparrow's conclusion that Vergil tries to avoid repetition, except that we should not assume from his reluctance to repeat lengthy speaking formulae that he was opposed to repetition in general. More likely he avoided such repetition because it served no useful purpose.

2. *Dawn and Night Formulae*

Sparrow's second list containing descriptions of dawn and night (pp. 85-87) reveals a good many repetitions, a fact he tries to pass over by saying that Vergil "rarely if ever used the same line or similar lines in two consecutive contexts of the same sort" (p. 87).[84] The list is fairly impressive:

2.8	et iam nox umida caelo praecipitat *suadentque cadentia sidera somnos.*
4.80	post ubi digressi, lumenque obscura vicissim luna premit *suadentque cadentia sidera somnos,*
3.147	*nox erat et terris animalia* SOmnus *habebat*:
4.522	*nox erat et* placidum carpebant FESSA SOPORem corpora per *terras,*
8.26	*nox erat et terras animalia* FESSA per omnis alituum pecudumque genus SOPOR altus *habebat.*
3.521	*iamque rubescebat* stell*is Aurora* fugatis
7.25	*iamque rubescebat* radii*s* mare et aethere ab alto *Aurora* in roseis fulgebat lutea bigis,
3.588	POSTERA iamque dies primo surgebat Eoo *umentemque Aurora polo dimoverat umbram,* *cum* subito...

est/ (1.614, 9.5), ...*ore locutus/* (4.276, 9.319), ...*et vox...fertur ad auris/* (3.40, 93), ...*sic voce precatur/* (9.403, 11.784), ...*haec insuper addit/* (11.107, 12.358).

[83] ὣς ηὔδα (6 times), ὣς ἔφατ' (15 times), ὣς φάτο (30 times), ὣς ἄρ' ἔφη (23 times), ἴσχεν (11 times), ἦ ῥα (10 times), ἦ (14 times).

[84] Similar exaggeration in Fordyce on 7.25f.: "To describe the dawn Virgil follows a Homeric cliche only at 4.584f., repeated with expansion at 9.459ff. Elsewhere his descriptions are varied and vivid..." Cf. Heinze (1915: 366-68), Cartault (1926: 345).

4.6	POSTERA PhoebeA LUSTRABAT LAMPADE TERRAS *umentemque Aurora polo dimoverat umbram* *cum...*
5.42	POSTERA *CUM PRIMO* stellas Oriente fugarat clarA DIES
7.148	POSTERA *CUM PRIMA* LUSTRABAT LAMPADE TERRAS ORTA DIES
12.113	POSTERA vix summos spargeBAT LuMinE montiS ORTA DIES
4.118	ubi primos crastinus ortus *extulerit* Titan *radiisque retexerit orbem.*
5.64	praeTEREA si nona diem MORTALIBUS ALMUM AURORA *extulerit radiisque retexerit orbem*
11.182	AURORA inTEREA miseris MORTALIBUS ALMUM *extulerat* lucem referens opera atque labores
4.129 = 11.1	*Oceanum interea surgens Aurora reliquit*
4.584 = 9.459-60	*et iam prima novo spargebat lumine terras* *Tithoni croceum linquens Aurora cubile.*

Nor does the number of these "apparently Homeric *iterata*" prove "that this form of repetition was difficult to avoid" (p. 87), for Apollonius certainly does manage to avoid it to a much greater degree:

Arg. 2.449	αὐτίκα ***δ' οὐ μετὰ δηρόν*** ἀμειβ***ομένων*** ***ἐφαάνθη*** ἠριγενής,
Arg. 2.1285	ἠὼς ***δ' οὐ μετὰ δηρὸν*** ἐελδ***ομέν***οισι ***φαάνθη.***
Arg. 2.1001	***νυκτί*** τ' ***ἐπιπλομένῃ*** Χαλύβων παρὰ γαῖαν ἵκοντο.
Arg. 2.1231	***νυκτὶ*** δ' ***ἐπιπλομένῃ*** Φιλυρηΐδα νῆσον ἄμειβον.
Arg. 1.1080	***...ἐπιπλομένῃ δ'*** ἐνὶ ***νυκτί***
Arg. 1.450	***ἦμος δ' ἠέλιος*** σταθερὸν παραμείβεται ἦμαρ,
Arg. 2.164	***ἦμος δ' ἠέλιος*** δροσερὰς ἐπέλαμψε κολώνας
Arg. 4.1629	***ἦμος δ' ἠέλιος*** μὲν ἔδυ,
Arg. 2.1119	υἱῆας Φρίξοιο μετ' ἠιόνας βάλε ***νήσου*** ***νύχθ' ὕπο λυγαίην.***
Arg. 4.458	***νύχθ' ὕπο λυγαίην*** ἱερῆς ἐπεβήσετο ***νήσου·***
Arg. 3.823	τῇ δ' ἀσπάσιον ***βάλε φέγγος*** ***ἠριγενής,***
Arg. 3.1224	Καυκάσου ***ἠριγενὴς ἠὼς βάλεν*** ἀντέλλουσα·
Arg. 4.981	***ἠὼς ἠριγενὴς φέγγος βάλε*** νισσομένοισιν.

To make his point Sparrow oversimplifies the poet's relationship to Homer, for he seems to think that Vergil must have zealously avoided

'epic' repetition, just because he did not slavishly imitate it. The latter is unlikely in a poet of Vergil's rank, the former unprovable by Sparrow's methods. The truth, as so often, lies in between. In a literate age a poet may not use formulae and repetitions in the same way or for the same purpose as the illiterate bard, but that does not bar him from using them altogether. Vergil does avoid standard lines like ἦμος δ' ἠριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἠώς, which punctuates the *Odyssey* with clock-like precision, and he uses such repetition less frequently than Homer. Yet it is difficult to explain some of the longer repetitions in any other terms except as imitations of Homeric practice. Because Vergil varied some lines does not mean he intended to vary all. Homer himself resorts to variation, especially in the *Iliad*, where but a single formula is repeated more than once, and where on one occasion (*Il.* 24.785) the more unusual epithet φαεσίμβροτος is substituted for the customary ῥοδοδάκτυλος, apparently for no other reason except that the latter occurs only three lines later. But it is Apollonius who goes farthest in the quest for variety. Vergil seems to have felt that the Alexandrian reaction to the epic style had been too extreme, and he therefore turns back to Homer, as is evident from the following table:

DESCRIPTIONS OF DAWN AND NIGHT

	Number of Descriptions	Repetition			
		5-11 elements	One line	More than one line	Total
Iliad	99	44	21	4	69
Odyssey	139	23	68	2	93
Argonautica	71	12	—	—	12
Aeneid	77	20	4	2	26

The nature of Vergil's relationship to the tradition emerges even more clearly if we compare the relative length of such descriptions in the four epics. The differences are indeed striking:

LENGTH OF DESCRIPTIONS OF DAWN AND NIGHT

	One word	Less than one line	One line	More than one line	Total
Iliad	18	40	27	14	99
Odyssey	24	40	67	8	139
Argonautica	28	19	9	15	71
Aeneid	7	22	15	33	77

Most Homeric descriptions take up no more than one line, whereas in Vergil almost half of them exceed one line. In Apollonius the descriptions are either confined to one word or a short phrase, or else they comprise several lines.[85] This disparity may be traced to a fundamental difference in the way such descriptions are used.

In Homer night and day relate to the action of the poems only in so far as they provide convenient termini for marking the passage of time, which moves on inexorably (except when retarded by the gods), and which Homer with his characteristic passion for detail never fails to describe. Like the Ocean on the Shield of Achilles it circumscribes the totality of the heroic world and presents a cosmic backdrop against which the human drama unfolds. Though at times the wording changes, the descriptions remain generic. Homer does not try to single out a particular day or night as unique, and so 'Dawn with her rosy fingers' rises regardless, whether she is to herald an eventful day, or quickly yield to dark night. Homer always deems it worth describing; he rarely dwells on it.

This is in striking contrast to the practice of Apollonius, for whereas Homer most commonly uses a full verse, we find that in the *Argonautica* two out of three descriptions consist of a short phrase or even a single word. Apollonius probably saw no need to single out each dawn or dusk, and so he often gives the occasion merely a curt ἐπὶ κνέφας, ἠῶθεν, ἦρι, or ἠοῖ, and passes on to more important business. But occasionally he extends his descriptions over several lines so as to provide an appropriate mood for the accompanying action. For example, he describes at length the night during which Medea lies awake, wrestling with her conflicting loyalties to her father and Jason (*Arg.* 3.744-50),[86] or the time of day when Jason and Medea enter the grove to steal the Golden Fleece (*Arg.* 4.109-113).[87] Thus in Apollonius the alternation of night and day is for the most part either conveyed through brief factual statements, or else expanded to longer descriptions that are specific and suited to the occasion. He is not

[85] 2 lines 6 times; 3 lines 6 times; 4, 5, and 7 lines once.

[86] Vergil's close imitation of the passage (4.522-33) suggests that he recognized its effectiveness (see below, pp. 173-75).

[87] Cf. also 1.1280-82, where dawn appears after the heroes had spent the whole night waiting for Heracles to return; 2.669-71 describes the twilight shortly before the appearance of Apollo; 3.1191-93 the night when Jason sacrifices to Hecate; in 3.1340-42 Apollonius aptly refers to the time when Jason, having plowed the field, unyokes the bronze-footed bulls as *boulyton* in imitation of similar Homeric passages (cf. *Il.* 16.779, *Od.* 9.58); and finally after the nocturnal marriage between Jason and Medea there follows a detailed description of dawn (4.1170-75), as the two wait to hear the decision of Alcinoos on whether Medea is to return to her father or stay with Jason.

interested in generic statements about recurring natural phenomena, but in describing a specific night or dawn which derives its significance from the events associated with it.

The several effective Apollonian examples may not have gone unnoticed by Vergil, whose own dawns and nights tend to occur at fairly important points in the poem and are often described at some length.[88] On the other hand, he avoided perfunctory references to time, and in admitting more repetition he showed that he did not share Apollonius' aversion to it. Whether he was emulating the Homeric style, or recognized the effects attainable through repetition, must for the moment be left unanswered. The fact that Vergil chose to return to Homer and ignore Alexandrian qualms about repetition is significant. His departure from the epic style as exemplified by Apollonius cannot be construed as anything other than a criticism of Alexandrian stylistic standards. When carried to excess, variation ceases to be a virtue, because for the tedium of repetition it merely substitutes an infinite variety that is equally tedious. By replacing the Homeric ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἠώς with ἦρι or ἠῶθεν Apollonius had avoided repetition only by being monochromatic, for the formula was at least vivid and lively, and its frequent return, like that of a Monteverdian *ritornello*, gave welcome reassurance of the unchanging order of things.

Vergil does not try to imitate Apollonius' characteristic brevity of style and narrative, but follows the more leisurely Homeric pace. Yet his return to a more Homeric style is tempered by what he seems to have learned from Apollonius, who had used natural phenomena to intensify the mood of a scene and whose repeated lines (though infrequent) recurred in contexts that were related. The relative importance of the events described seems to govern Vergil's use of repetition to a greater extent than considerations of stylistic decorum, and that is probably why speaking formulae are subject to more variation than dawn and night formulae. Still the primary model was obviously Homer, for Homer was *the* epic poet par excellence. The many imitations of Homer had no doubt been noticed before Perellius Faustus published his list of *furta*, and they have led kindlier critics like Macrobius to discourse widely on the relative merits of the two poets. The list of imitations and translations of Homeric lines has continued to be compiled and amplified ever since. But Vergil's debt to

[88] Worstbrock (1963: 180-81) finds the epithets in Vergil's descriptions usually suited to the context they introduce. Such contextual appropriateness, already noticed by Asinius Pollio (cf. Servius on 11.183), may conceivably also derive from Alexandrian models, although Vivante (1979) has recently suggested that even the Homeric dawns conform to their contexts.

Homer is not just linguistic and phraseological. He does not merely borrow random lines and phrases and on occasion imitate a whole scene, but (as Knauer has shown) he has produced in the *Aeneid* a deliberate and carefully planned *contaminatio* of the two Homeric epics. Vergil's imitation of Homer takes place on many levels: he transforms not only epithets, phrases, and formulae, but even the larger structures and themes of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. It is literary *agōn* at its best and most intense.[89] Repetition, more than anything else, is the distinguishing characteristic of the Homeric style. If elsewhere Vergil was going to vie with Homer not in the manner of Apollonius by being different, but by emulating content and style, then he could not have failed to take up the challenge presented by

[89] Knauer (1964: 332) called it an imitative transformation ("nachahmende Umformung"). Otis (1969: 28-29, 58-61) objected to the notion of rivalry or imitation and criticized Knauer's suggestion that the relationship between the *Aeneid* and the Homeric epics was typological. The first objection is surprising. One only needs to look at Quintilian to recognize how obsessed the Romans were with setting their achievements against those of the Greeks (see Kroll 1924: 14-15). Vergil's *Aeneid* invited, in fact compelled comparison with Homer. Nothing is gained by saying that Vergil "reproduced" rather than imitated Homer (1969: 28), for the term is more obscure than the complex process of imitation described by Knauer. The main point of controversy, of course, is not the fact of imitation, but its manner and purpose. Otis believes that Vergil used Homer "as a source of symbols, a means of giving heroic connotation to contemporary reality" (1969: 29). I find this kind of symbolic interpretation less attractive than typology, because it restricts the range of possibilities without necessarily augmenting precision and clarity. Symbolism functions by establishing a simple equation between two things, whereas typology can encompass parallels, contrasts, inversions, as well as symbols. One can talk of Laomedon, Helen, or Penelope as symbols, but it is less useful to do so about the Trojan War or the wanderings of Odysseus. Furthermore, such an approach tends to view Homer as a quarry for Vergilian symbols (cf. 1969: 51), which fragments Homer's impact on Vergil and fails to account for the complex interconnections between Vergilian and Homeric scenes, or between the whole *Aeneid* and all of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. It is one of the merits of Knauer's study to have shown how carefully Vergil has transformed and thereby reinterpreted both Homeric poems, and the import of such reinterpretation can only be properly grasped if set against the original. Hence typology. I share Otis' objection (1969: 61) to Knauer's use of *Christian* typology as an analogue (cf. 1964: 353-56), but for different reasons. His pattern works only with an optimistic interpretation of the poem, where Aeneas and Augustus succeed in establishing an eschatologically determined higher order of things. It excludes the doubt, despair, and intimations of ultimate failure, which an increasing number of scholars have seen in the *Aeneid*. I prefer a typological interpretation that admits of parallels as well as inversions, and one that looks back to Homer as well as forward to later Roman history (for the latter cf. Worstbrock 1963: 119). Such typological thinking is not unknown in Hellenistic art, such as the victory dedications of Attalus I, which juxtapose mythical and historical events (Knauer 1964: 355 n3 quoting Julius Schlosser, *Präludien, Vorträge und Aufsätze* [Berlin, 1927], p. 27). The process somewhat resembles that observed by Mircea Eliade in his *The Myth of the Eternal Return* (Princeton, 1954) and *The Sacred and the Profane* (New York, 1959), although Eliade's concern is not with art or literary history, but with the mentality of archaic man that tries to relate everyday events to divine archetypes, thus imparting sacred meaning to profane existence.

Homeric repetition.[90] In fact, it would have been very surprising if in the *Aeneid* Vergil had used repetition sparingly or not at all.

[90] This does not mean that Vergil would have used repetition exactly as Homer had done, for he rarely imitates without adapting, modifying, or even improving. For examples of 'improvement' based on ancient Homeric literary criticism see Schlunk (1974).

CHAPTER THREE

DESIGN AND TEXTURE

Vergil's dependence on the epic tradition is amply attested by the many epithets and other formulae in the *Aeneid* which imitate Homeric and Ennian patterns. While closer scrutiny of individual examples reveals differences between traditional and Vergilian usage, as an aggregate these repetitions create the impression of a formulaic texture that marks the poem as epic in style. Repetition of this sort is primarily decorative and often generic in quality. As such it stands at the opposite end of the spectrum from repetition that may be called 'referential', which relies on the reader to recognize its source so as to perceive the passage before him in the light of new associations. Unlike the decorative kind, which emphasizes the surface texture, this form of repetition is intimately connected with structure and meaning, and thus it reflects the poem's inner logic and artistic design.

The notion of referential or artistic repetition as a viable poetic technique has been questioned on several grounds. Sparrow thought it "unlikely that Virgil, having introduced into his poem a certain number of lines repeated with a carefully designed effect, would have allowed them to be swamped in the completed work by innumerable other repetitions from which that effect... was utterly absent" (p. 70). As one might expect, he finds very few 'effective' repetitions (pp. 65-70), for if the most obvious types (e.g. anaphora, rhetorical repetition, refrains, prophecies, ritual formulae) are subtracted, one is left with less than a dozen exmples, and even on these Sparrow casts the suspicion that they may be stopgaps. Unnecessarily restrictive criteria of what constitutes 'effective' repetition help bolster his list of random repetitions and stack the evidence in his favor. His reasoning that effectiveness is diminished by repetitions having no artistic function applies only to cases where the *same* line is repeated many times. Vergil does not run the risk of diluting any intended effect, for he rarely repeats a line more than once. Moreover, the reader does not accept a repetition as significant just because others have been, nor is he ready to reject an obvious echo because he cannot explain others. The artistic effectiveness of a repetition must be judged on its own merits and solely within the framework of the associations it evokes.

Another objection is that such a technique places unreasonable demands on the reader, for the distance between repetitions at times exceeds what one's recollection could have been expected to span. It is well to remember, however, that the ancients had a much more highly developed aural memory, and that their sensitivity to sound had been conditioned by their habit of reading literature aloud.[1] This enabled them to linger over the melody of the lines and consequently retain and recall them more easily than we do nowadays, when the eye far outstrips the tongue. One might also add that there is no reason to expect the poet to be shackled by the limitations of the 'average reader'. Allusions that only a few readers could appreciate are not unknown in Augustan poetry.[2] It would therefore not be surprising if Vergil used some repetitions in ways that are less than obvious.

The term 'artistic repetition' implies a level of conscious intent one obviously cannot claim for all repetitions, nor even for all that are effective. Though Vergil must have planned some from the beginning and introduced more in the course of composition or revision, many repetitions, especially the shorter ones, he no doubt used unconsciously. To distinguish between them is neither feasible nor very important. The creative process is in large part intuitive. Whatever is good and effective in a poem does not necessarily derive from conscious planning and deliberate

---

[1] On reading habits in antiquity see Hendrickson (1929), who argues that silent reading was the exception rather than the norm. Objections to this were raised by Clark (1931) and recently by Knox (1968). Knox makes the strongest case for the prevalence of silent reading, though he agrees that literary texts were normally read aloud. That is what really matters here. Kroll (1924: 151) reminds us that the memory of the ancients was able to surpass ours because it was not overburdened with all kinds of information and because the unwieldy nature of their books forced them to rely on their memory much more than we do. Havelock (1963) has presented a compelling argument that down to the fourth century Greek education and culture were still essentially oral. I suspect that aspects of this oral state have persisted considerably longer. In Vergil's time there was a larger reading public and an abundance of books, but written communication was still perceived in oral terms, namely as something heard, not seen. Prose and poetry were written largely for the ear, while the eye normally acted like the needle of a phonograph, transforming markings on a page into sound. Silent reading surely existed, but it was not the best kind of reading. This seems to have been true even two centuries later, for when Lucian berates his ignorant book-collector for his reading habits—καὶ ἀναγιγνώσκεις ἔνια πάνυ ἐπιτρέχων, φθάνοντος τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ τὸ στόμα (*Ind.* 2), his point seems to be that for proper comprehension and appreciation one must read more slowly and aloud (for a different interpretation see Knox 1968: 424-25). On the implications of reading aloud for the understanding of Roman poetry see G. Williams (1968: 683-84).

[2] E.g. the elaborate imitation of Aratus' acrostic (*Phaen.* 783-87) in *Georgics* 1.429-33, where at the beginning of alternate verses we have MA[ro], VE[rgilius], PU[blius]. See E. L. Brown (1963: 96-114), Ross (1975: 28-29).

execution. A repetition may arise because the poet had subconsciously associated certain events or scenes, in which case it brings this subconscious process to the surface, providing insight into the poet's mind at work and thereby helping us understand his poem. Such a process of association probably accounts for the many shorter reminiscences which occur in scenes joined by artistic repetition, so that subconscious echoes support what appears to be intentional and thus further reveal the patterns and relationships with which the poet is concerned. Thus verbal repetition may accompany thematic similarity, but may not necessarily be caused by it. To say that whenever Vergil has to describe similar events, he naturally lapses into phrases used before, ignores the fact that these events are not things to be reported but elements carefully integrated in a larger poetic fabric. Closer examination of thematic parallels often reveals designs of a complexity one would hesitate attributing to mere chance or Vergil's repetitive mind. Vergil's painstaking method of composition and the careful plan of the *Aeneid* with its intricate balances of scenes and episodes suggest that external similarity between scenes is not accidental, but rather part of his poetic design, in fact part of the meaning of the poem. If this is so, verbal repetition would tend to reinforce thematic repetition, and its function would be similar to what in the case of Homeric or Apollonian imitation has been called *Leitzitat*[3] or *Anfangshinweis*.[4]

The storms in Books 1 and 4 provide an illustration of this technique. Thematic and structural similarities leave no doubt that the two episodes are meant to balance one another.[5] Each time Juno sets things in motion. Her meeting with Aeolus (1.65-80) corresponds to the one with Venus (4.90-118). The storm at sea, which threatens the Trojans with physical annihilation, brings on the intervention of Neptune; the storm she unleashes in Book 4 aims to subvert fate by depriving Aeneas of the will to complete his mission and so requires the intervention of Jupiter himself. This second storm is not necessary to motivate what follows; it is merely a convenient way of isolating Dido and Aeneas so that the *conubium* may take place. But it is also a brilliant dramatic stroke. The storm accompanies Juno like a *leitmotif*, for this is her characteristic *modus operandi* and a symbol of her defiance.[6] Its recurrence marks the obstinacy of her antagonism

---

[3] Knauer (1964: 145-46).

[4] Hügi (1952: 41-42).

[5] For structural parallels and contrasts between Books 1 and 4 see Koch (1966).

[6] This view of the storm's symbolic function is of course indebted to Pöschl's treatment of Vergilian storm imagery (see 1977: 13-19, 28-33, 106). Juno's opposition has frequently

and implies that a new phase of operations has begun. Her plan had been revealed to Venus, but the true nature of the storm becomes fully apparent only with the first line of the description:

4.160 *interea magno misceri murmure* caelum
incipit.

It recalls the earlier storm, which is raging with all its force when Neptune finally hears the commotion:

1.124 *interea magno misceri murmure* pontum[7]
emissamque hiemem sensit Neptunus,

and rises from the sea just in time to rescue the Trojans from imminent death. The reminiscence evokes a sense of impending calamity and in so doing provides the right perspective. This is no ordinary thunderstorm, no mere diversionary maneuver, but the overture to a tragic drama.[8]

The effect achieved depends in large part on the repeated line which emphasizes the continuity of action and mood, and helps to elevate Juno's storm into the realm of tragic symbolism. Any further variation would have been detrimental. In fact, Vergil is not content to rely on just one repetition to assure the desired effect. When Juno reveals to Venus her plan and proposes to unite Dido and Aeneas in marriage:

4.126 *conubio iungam stabili propriamque dicabo*,[9]

---

been perceived as irrational and even evil, e.g. Highet (1972: 130) commenting on a possible obscenity in 12.828: "Vergil never treats Juno with anything but revulsion and hatred: for him she is a devil, and devils can speak foully." This is hardly the case. For a more balanced view of her role and particularly her relationship to the *fata*, see Pötscher (1977: 139-57) and Buchheit (1963).

[7] The line is remarkable for its triple alliteration which suggests that it may derive from early Roman poetry (Cartault 1926: 146). The variation of *pontus* to *caelum*, though required by the context, also expresses the gradual spread of Juno's activity. Having failed to achieve her objective in the element of Neptune, she encroaches in her second storm on the realm of Jupiter, and will eventually turn to the underworld for a last attempt to thwart fate (7.312).

[8] For the musical metaphor see Pöschl (1977: 14, 27), whose symbolic interpretation of the storm is also followed by Perret (1952: 94).

[9] A problematic line retained by recent editors, but in the past condemned by many (e.g. Peerlkamp, Ribbeck, Forbiger, Haupt, Ladewig, Mackail, Sparrow) as an irrelevant interpolation. It is attested in *M* and *R* (*P* is lacking here), Servius, Servius D., and quoted in *Anth. Lat.* 10.31 and 18.45 (pp. 40 and 81 in Riese) in contexts suggesting that the Book 4 passage was the source. The main problem is the sudden shift from the plural to the singular. In 1.73 *iungam* applies to Deiopeia, but in Book 4, where the whole conversation has been about Dido *and* Aeneas (cf. *ire parant, devenient*), one is led to understand *coniugio iungam stabili* as referring to both, only to be jarred by the singular *propriamque dicabo*. A possible solution might be to take *iungam* as meaning that Juno will join *Dido* to Aeneas in marriage. Juno's deferential gesture to Venus (*tua si mihi certa voluntas*, 125) interrupts her description of the hunt and makes the transition to the singular somewhat less harsh.

Peerlkamp objected on other grounds: *Connubium his verbis significatur plane legitimum, solem-*

she uses the same words she had previously addressed to Aeolus when she promised him the nymph Deiopeia as a reward for his cooperation:

1.72 quarum quae forma pulcherrima Deiopeia,
conubio iungam stabili propriamque dicabo.[10]

It is significant that the very first scene of the *Aeneid* should depict Juno wielding her not inconsiderable match-making powers to bend Aeolus to her will. This immediately establishes her role and her mode of action. She is a marriage goddess, and as such she figures prominently in the poem. Her opposition to Jupiter takes the form of making or preventing marriages, and it is all the more effective, because Jupiter's main concern is the birth of the Roman race made possible through a dynastic union and the fusion of two nations.[11] Marriage is thus her most potent weapon, as we indeed learn at the very beginning. The Aeolus scene is paradigmatic. It provides a pattern for Juno's activity in Book 4, while the repetition, by accentuating the similarity between the two scenes, suggests that the consequences will be analogous. Juno has managed to beguile Aeolus with the promise of a beautiful nymph; now she hopes to divert Aeneas from his mission by marrying him off to Dido.[12] Both go astray. Aeolus violates the *certum foedus* (cf. 1.62) under which he rules the winds. Aeneas temporarily

---

ni ritu initum. Sed tale connubium ita in spelunca contrahi non poterat. Immo in spelunca aliquid fieret, unde connubium stabile oriretur. Hoc aliquid Juno honeste 'hymenaeum' appellat. Yet the issue is not whether a formal *conubium* could have taken place in a cave (presumably the presence of *pronuba Iuno* would legitimate any union). Juno's interest is clear: only a legitimate marriage could bind Aeneas to stay at Carthage, and that is why she talks of a *conubium stabile.* But even for simple dramatic reasons Vergil cannot allow such a union to take place, and that is why the whole situation remains ambiguous, for only so could Dido and Aeneas arrive at such divergent interpretations.

The incongruity Peerlkamp notices between *conubium* and *hymenaeus* is not serious, and perhaps intentional. But Vergil may not have distinguished between the two terms, for he later has Dido use them as if they were synonymous: *per conubia nostra, per inceptos hymenaeos* (4.316; cf. Serv. D.: *bis idem dicit* and Cat. 64.141). Vergil frequently restates the same thought in different words (cf. Guglielmino 1901) or rounds out a paragraph with a summary like *hic hymenaeus erit.* The latter by itself would be a pointless understatement. Cf. Austin on 1.73 and 4.126, Guillemin (1951: 247-54), and particularly G. Williams (1968: 370-87) for an excellent discussion of both contexts.

[10] A close translation of *Il.* 14.268, where Hera offers Hypnos one of the Graces in return for his services.

[11] This theme of uniting two nations is already sounded by Dido in 1.573.

[12] This marriage plan is foreshadowed at the first entrance of Dido: *forma pulcherrima Dido,/ incessit* (1.496-97). The striking emphasis on Dido's physical beauty echoes the offer of the nymph to Aeolus: *forma pulcherrima Deiopeia/* (1.72), and thereby hints at the role Dido is soon to play. Aeneas himself as he joins Dido for the hunt is *ante alios pulcherrimus omnis* (4.141). As if in anticipation of their impending union, the beauty of Dido and Aeneas is celebrated like that of a bride and groom in a traditional epithalamium. Cartault (1926: 346) finds the matching of Dido's beauty by that of Aeneas intentional.

forgets his duty and his *pietas*. But whereas Neptune can quickly calm the raging sea, the confusion brought on by that clandestine union between Dido and Aeneas affects not only the present, but even the distant future.

There is a further reason why Vergil may have wished to link these scenes in Books 1 and 4. Although Neptune's timely appearance prevents the complete annihilation of Aeneas' fleet, the plot of Juno is not entirely foiled. Instead of sailing to Italy, Aeneas lands at Carthage. Perhaps this landing was not part of Juno's purpose in rousing the storm, but one cannot help noticing that the first storm brings Aeneas to Dido, and the second directs them both to the cave where their passion is consummated. In this way Juno's bribe to Aeolus not only prefigures, but even becomes ancillary to the *conubium*.

The approach in this chapter is not particularly new. Recent criticism has often assumed that repetitions are a part of Vergil's artistic design, but there has been no general treatment of the problem. Whatever we have come to understand about the function of repetition is for the most part a by-product of investigations into other aspects of the poem, such as structure, imagery, symbolism, or thematic patterns. We should begin with the repetitions themselves and see if their occurrence can in some way be justified or explained. To do so for every single repetition is impossible, for it would involve a complete reinterpretation of the *Aeneid*. Nor is that necessary. The validity of the assumption that Vergil was sensitive to the effect of repeated lines and made them serve his artistic purpose does not depend on the demonstration of such a purpose for all repetitions.

The repetitions examined here will for the most part range from four feet to four lines. In concentrating on the longer examples I am guided by the assumption that a poet's awareness of his repetitions stands in some relationship to their length, so that the longer is more likely to be intentional. This rule of thumb is of course limited in usefulness, for awareness does not necessarily coincide with artistic effectiveness, nor can effectiveness be measured in metrical feet. A formulaic line such as *at Messapus, equum domitor, Neptunia proles*, repeated three times (7.691, 9.523, 12.128) without any apparent reason, may be less significant than a phrase such as *solvuntur frigore membra*, which first describes Aeneas' despair in the storm (1.92) and then recurs at the moment of his final victory over Turnus (12.951).[13]

[13] The Homeric model is of course the reaction of Odysseus to the storm (*Od.* 5.297). See the excellent analysis of Knauer (1964: 320-22), followed by Highet (1972: 29), and for somewhat different interpretations Wlosok (1967: 14 n3), Segal (1974: 51-52), Putnam (1965: 200-201).

A few words of explanation about the functional categories employed in the discussion that follows. At the beginning of this chapter we have distinguished between two general types of repetition: those that reproduce the formulaic texture of traditional epic, and those that articulate the structural and thematic design of the poem. The two are not mutually exclusive, for all repetitions regardless of function contribute to the impression that the poem is epic in style, and thus in a sense they all play what might be called a 'decorative' role. What distinguishes the purely decorative kind from the others is its emphasis on generic qualities that identify characters, actions, and events as belonging to a certain type. Imitations of Homeric and Ennian epithets or formulae provide the best examples of this function and constitute decorative repetition in its simplest form. By analogy with this, other kinds of repetition develop that also have no specific relevance, but rather intensify a mood or, like the generalizing heroic epithet, point up the universal aspects of a given passage. The 'referential' sort differs from these by being concerned with particulars and their relationship to other particulars. Such repetitions influence meaning because the associations they evoke cause the reader to modify his response to the text. The most obvious instance of this technique is found in direct quotations affirming or rejecting what has been said before. When the cross-reference occurs in the narrative portions of the poem, it may emphasize the structure of the particular compositional unit by way of framing or ring-composition. Finally, we may observe the technique in its most general form when a repetition reveals thematic parallels, suggesting that an event is analogous to, or contrasts with, or has been foreshadowed by, an earlier one.[14] This last type functions not unlike a metaphor or, to be more precise, a form of synecdoche.[15] When the recurrence of a line is recognized, the old context of which it was part also comes into play and influences how the new passage is perceived. Thus in the examples cited above, the repetition describing the storm in Book 4

[14] Terms like 'earlier', 'echo', 'reminiscence' are merely convenient ways of referring to a repetition from an earlier book of the *Aeneid* that the *reader* might perceive as an echo. They are not to be construed as expressing the belief that such lines were necessarily written before the others.

[15] This technique conforms with what has generally been observed about the allusive and elliptical nature of Roman poetry. G. Williams has illustrated the kinds of demands often placed on the reader, who is expected for properly understanding a poem to reconstruct its setting and background from various clues (1968: 171-249) or to recognize references to specific Greek poems (1968: 250-357). Particularly relevant for the present discussion is Williams' most recent book (1980) on metaphoric and metonymic modes of thought in Augustan poetry, which unfortunately appeared too late to be systematically taken into account here.

(4.160 = 1.124) connects it to the earlier storm and thereby transfers the memory of that narrow escape from catastrophe onto a scene whose baleful consequences are adumbrated only later (4.169-70).

I. TEXTURE

The examples to be considered in this section usually have no specific reference and thus do not direct the reader's attention to earlier scenes, even though they may be perceived as repetitions. Their function rather seems to be decorative and emphatic, qualifying the mood of a particular passage and generally contributing to what might be called the 'epic texture' of the poem.

A. *Epithets and Characters*

Vergil's extensive use of epithets constitutes the most obvious example of how he imitates traditional epic language,[16] but while his epithets are formed analogically from Homer's and so retain an epic flavor, their application differs in ways consistent with what has been observed about his formulae in the previous chapter. In Homer there is greater fixity of patterns, so that an epithet often accompanies its noun without much regard for its context. Vergil appears to have taken greater care in choosing epithets to suit the contexts in which they occur, as Moseley has shown.[17] But the differences go further. According to Worstbrock (1963: 168-77) Vergil uses epithets even more frequently than Homer, but the quality of the epithets differs markedly. Homer's epithets are often picturesque and memorable, whereas in Vergil over half are composed of conventional adjectives such as *magnus*, *altus*, *longus*, *tantus*. Compound epithets, so common in Homer, are relatively rare despite a number of bold formations that go back to Ennius and Lucretius. Worstbrock also notes (pp. 193-98) that quantitative epithets (*magnus*, *summus*, *ingens*, etc.) are particularly frequent (ten times more than other epithets) and have the effect of lending Vergil's style a loftiness traditionally associated with epic, a monumental quality that evokes a sense of wonder—the Vergilian *mirabile dictu*.

[16] Milman Parry's classic study of Homeric epithets, now readily accessible in 1971: 1-190, contains valuable comments on Vergilian and Apollonian repetitions (cf. pp. 24-36, 169-71). Also very helpful is Cordier (1939a), particularly the list of Vergilian imitations of epic language (pp. 69-87) and his discussion of the ornamental function of epithets (pp. 200-208). Cordier, however, does not concern himself with formulaic repetition in Vergil.

[17] See 1926: 1-7 and *passim*, but cf. the criticism of Cordier (1930). For the effectiveness of some Homeric epithets see Whallon (1961; 1966; 1969: 1-70).

Our concern here is not with epithets in general, but with repeated noun-epithet formulae and their relationship to the epic tradition. It is evident from what we have already observed that Vergil wishes to appear rather than be Homeric. His aim is not to reproduce the traditional epic style, but to suggest an affinity with such a style. He does this in several ways. The most obvious include translations of Homeric formulae and borrowings from the Latin hexameter tradition. Next, there are analogical formations based closely on Homeric or Ennian patterns. Finally, there is a host of Vergilian phrases that depend less on similarity with traditional patterns than on repetition to produce the desired effect. These comprise the majority of the examples considered here.

1. *Simple Noun-Epithet Formulae*

Jupiter:

/ ⏑́ *pater ómnipoténs*	(*sed* 1.60; *vel* 4.25; *at* 6.592; *hic* 7.141; *tum* 7.770, 10.100; *nec* 8.398; *et* 12.178)

Lucretius (5.399) has /*at pater omnipotens*, which may derive from Ennius (cf. /*at* ego *omnipotens*, *Sc.* 177; *pater* optime Olympi, *Ann.* 192; Iovis *omnipotentis*, *Ann.* 458).[18] No single Homeric source accounts for the formula, which seems to combine the common phrase πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε (*Il.* 1.544 = *Od.* 12.445, etc.) with expressions like ὃς πᾶσιν ἀνάσσει (*Od.* 9.552 = 13.25).

Juno:

máxima Iúno/	(4.371, 8.84, 10.685)
régia Iúno/	(1.443, 4.114, 7.438, 10.62)
Satúrnia Iúno/	(3.380, 5.606, 9.2,745,802, 10.760, 12.156)

The first two resemble the Homeric πότνια Ἥρη (*Il.* 1.551 = *Od.* 4.513, etc.), while the last appears in Ennius *Ann.* 64.[19]

/c*ára Iovís coniúnx*	(4.91)
/saév*a Iovís coniúnx*	(7.287)
/ást ego, mágn*a Iovís coniúnx*	(7.308)

The formula inverts the Homeric phrase that defines Zeus by his marriage to Hera: ἐρίγδουπος πόσις Ἥρης (*Il.* 7.411 = *Od.* 8.465, etc.).

Aeneas:

/*mágnanimum Aéneán*	(1.260, 9.204)
/*mágnanime Aéneá*	(5.17)

[18] Cf. Norden on 6.592. Cordier (1939a: 242, 270 n2) believes that *omnipotens* derives from religious language.

[19] On the appropriateness of the epithet *Saturnia* see Moseley (1926: 31-36) and cf. Cordier (1939a: 203-204), Amerasinghe (1953), MacKay (1956).

A translation of μεγαλήτορος Αἰνείαο/ (*Il.* 20.175, etc.).[20]

/quós bonus Aéneás	(5.770, 11.106)

Though *bonus* may suggest ἀγαθός, its 'moral' sense is un-Homeric.[21]

/ ⏗ pater Aéneás	(*at* 5.545, 700, 12.697; *et* 1.580, 3.343, 12.440; *tum* 5.348, 461, 8.115; *cum* 11.904; *iam* 1.699, 11.184; *huc* 8.606; *hinc* 12.166; *quos* 9.172; *sic* 3.716)
/ ⏗ pius Aéneás	(*at* 1.305, 4.393, 6.9, 232, 12.311; *tum* 5.26, 685, 10.783, 12.175; *sum* 1.378; *quam* 8.84, 11.170; *quem* 10.591; *quid* 10.826; *hoc* 5.286)

Homer has no epithet equivalent to *pius*, and he applies πατήρ only to gods (primarily Zeus). The Vergilian formulae seem formed by analogy with other Homeric epithets (e.g. δῖος), although Ennius may have been influential, for he applies *pius* to Anchises (*Ann.* 30-31) and *pater* to (the deified) Romulus (*Ann.* 113, 117).[22]

/Tróius Aéneás	(1.596, 6.403, 7.221)
...Tróius hérosl	(6.451, 8.530, 10.584, 886, 12.502)
/Trós Anchísiadé(s)	(6.126, 10.250)

In Homer epithets of heroes are rarely derived from place-names (Γερήνιος is used with Nestor); Vergil has many such examples (e.g. *Sidonius*, *Argolicus*, *Larisaeus*, *Tirynthius*).[23]

/túm satus Ánchisá	(5.244, 424, 7.152; cf. 6.331)
/náte deá	(11 times, all but 4 at verse beginning)

Expressions involving *satus* are archaic alternatives to the patronymic, as are *generatus* (6.322) and *genitus* (6.131, 9.642).[24] *Nate dea* seems to be the Latin equivalent of διογενής.

Anchises and Ascanius:

/ ⏗ pater Ánchisés	(*et* 3.9, 263, 539, 558; *at* 2.687, 6.679; *tum* 3.525, 6.713, 867; *sic* 6.854; *hoc* 7.245)

[20] The epithet occurs in Lucr. 5.400, Cat. 64.85 (cf. Cordier 1939a: 256, 263, 304-305). On its use with Aeneas see Carlsson (1945: 122-23); Worstbrock (1963: 191) notes that the epithet is limited to Jupiter, Aeneas, and his Trojan ancestors.

[21] M. Parry (1971: 31) and cf. Cordier (1939a: 204 n4).

[22] Liv. Andron. has *impius Cyclops* (fr. 32 Morel). For the significance of *pius* and *pater* in the *Aeneid* see Moseley (1926: 70-88), Kroll (1924: 276), Cartault (1926: 151), Knoche (1956), Worstbrock (1963: 190-192), and Pease on 4.393.

[23] Cordier (1939a: 190) attributes such epithets to Alexandrian influence.

[24] *Satus* occurs in Accius fr. 653 (Rib.) and *Inc. inc. fab.* fr. 102 (Rib.). Cf. Cordier (1939a: 39, 67-68, 190, 209-10), also Norden and Austin on 6.125, 322, 331.

/ ⏗ patris Ánchisaé	(*me* 4.351; *nec* 4.427; *et* 5.31; *hoc* 10.534)
...Dárdanió Anchísael	(1.617, 9.647)
/át puer Áscaniús	(1.267, 4.156, 10.236; cf. 3.339, 4.354, 5.74)

Epithets derived from proper nouns are very rare in Homer, but common in Vergil: *Dardanius* (also of Aeneas), *Priameius*, *Laomedontius*, *Evandrius*.[25] The other phrases are similar to *pater Aeneas*, *puer* being metrically equivalent to *pater*.

Dido:

...Sidónia Dídol	(1.446, 613, 9.266, 11.74)
...pulchérrima Dídol	(1.496, 4.60)
...néscia Dídol	(1.299)
...ínscia Dídol	(1.718)
/ínfelíx Didó	(1.749, 6.68, 4.596, 6.456)

Sidonia Dido may have arisen by analogy with *Saturnia Iuno*, but (like *Troius* above) the epithet is un-Homeric. *Pulcherrima*, though a common attribute (cf. *Romulus pulcher*, Enn. *Ann.* 80), may have been influenced by expressions like περικαλλέα κούρην (*Il.* 16.85) and δῖα γυναικῶν (*Il.* 3.171, etc.). Ennius calls Venus *pulchra dearum* (*Ann.* 18), apparently translating the Homeric δῖα θεάων. *Infelix*, *nescia*, and *inscia* are later epithets, for Homer does not in his epithets allude to an individual's happiness, ignorance, or fate. Calvus' *Io* (fr. 9 Morel: *a virgo infelix*, already imitated in *E* 6.47) could have provided a pattern.[26]

Achates:

— fídus Achátesl	(*et* 8.521, 586, 12.384; *cui* 6.158; cf. 1.188, 10.332)

Trusty Achates is to Aeneas what ἐρίηρες ἑταῖροι are to Odysseus (cf. *Od.* 9.172, etc.) and several heroes in the *Iliad* (cf. 3.378, etc.), but the epithet itself is probably formed by analogy with *pius Aeneas*. The process of analogical formation continues in several directions:

fortis Achates, -ael	(1.579, 120)
hospes Acestesl	(5.63, 630)
et fortis Asilasl	(12.127, 550)
fortemque Cloanthuml	(1.222, 510, 612)
fortemque Serestuml	(4.288, 12.561)
acerque Serestusl	(9.171, 779, 12.549)
acer Atinasl	(11.869, 12.661)

[25] Cf. Cordier (1939a: 190, 208).

[26] On the function of these epithets see Moseley (1926: 22-26), though some of his comments are misguided; Worstbrock (1963: 187-90) is better. On *Sidonia* cf. Cordier (1939a: 203).

Phrases such as *pater Aeneas* or *puer Ascanius*, which are themselves already extensions of Homeric formulae, lead to the formation of others such as *Lavinia coniunx/* (6.764, 7.314, 12.17, 937; cf. 12.80) and *Lavinia virgo/* (7.72, 11.479), where virginity and wifehood characterize Lavinia just as paternity had marked Aeneas or boyhood Ascanius. From the metrically stable *coniunx* develop circumlocutions like *regia coniunx/* (Lavinia 2.783, 11.371; Amata 7.56), *Saturnia coniunx/* (12.178; cf. *Saturnia Iuno*, above), *Aegyptia coniunx/* (8.688). In like fashion *virgo* gives rise to *Panopeaque virgo/* (5.240, 825), and also to *Priameia virgo/* (2.403, 3.321), *Cocytia virgo/* (7.479), *Tritonia virgo/* (11.483), *Latonia virgo/* (11.557), *Larinaque virgo/* (11.655). *Troiana iuventus/* (1.467, 699, 2.63, 4.162, 8.182) is not strictly formulaic, but repetition and kindred expressions like *(de)lecta iuventus* (4.130, 8.499, 606, 9.226) make it seem so.

The formulaic texture of the *Aeneid* depends on repeated patterns. Variation, while more extensive than in Homer, does not necessarily negate this effect nor does it primarily spring from a desire to avoid repetition. Sometimes there are only expansions and substitutions within the same basic pattern:

Phoebique sacerdos/	(2.319, 3.80)
Phoebi Triviaeque sacerdos/	(6.35, 10.537)
longaeva sacerdos/	(6.321)
Phoebi longaeva sacerdos/	(6.628)

Or else variation may reflect an artistic purpose. In Book 8, for example, Evander changes his form of address each time he speaks to Aeneas. In the first encounter he greets him as *fortissime Teucrum/* (8.154), but the next morning he begins the speech in which he gives Aeneas command over the Etruscan forces with */maxime Teucrorum ductor* (8.470) and near the end he calls him *Teucrum atque Italum fortissime ductor/* (8.513). What at first glance may seem like elegant variation is a carefully planned progression climaxing in the title that combines Aeneas' old role with his new.

Meter is responsible for some of the regularity observed. Spondaic words, for instance, gravitate to the end of the verse, while a choriamb or molossus usually begins the second foot. These metrically stable words can in turn by association with others produce patterns that eventually harden into formulae. Through the use of fixed epithets oral poetry encourages such spontaneous generation of formulae to aid versification. In a literary epic that is a lesser concern, and consequently the quantity or quality of epithets also changes. Epithets are crucial to Homer's formulaic system and for that reason quite common. In Apollonius their role is considerably diminished, while in Vergil, despite great frequency, they have relatively

little to do with aiding composition. A comparison of how the three poets use epithets yields the following results:[27]

METRICAL VALUE OF NAME	HOMER (13 names)			APOLLONIUS (10 names)			VERGIL (16 names)		
	with epithet	without	proportion	with epithet	without	proportion	with epithet	without	proportion
— ⏓	177	164	1:0.9	7	29	1:4.1	62	106	1:1.7
⏑ — ⏓	509	416	1:0.8	5	32	1:6.4	47	52	1:1.1
— — ⏓	19	96	1:5.1	5	25	1:5	65	112	1:1.7
— ⏑ ⏑ —	27	48	1:1.8	7	25	1:3.6	13	18	1:1.4
TOTAL	732	724	1:1	24	111	1:4.6	187	288	1:1.5

Apollonius avoids not only epithets, but even the repetition of names, for more often than not he resorts to patronymics and other forms of circumlocution.[28] By contrast, the abundance of epithets in Vergil bears witness to different poetic and stylistic aims. Parry (1971: 29-36) had noticed long ago that *Aeneas* gets an epithet much more often than metrically equivalent names in Homer, not to mention Apollonius, but he considered this an exception and maintained that elsewhere Vergil hardly made use of epithets. Such a conclusion is unwarranted, for not only are there many other examples, but in fact epithets are more plentiful in Vergil than in Homer.[29] Although Vergilian epithets are on the whole different, for they do not replicate the ornamental quality of Homeric epithets but merely suggest it through repetition, their number points to Homer as a source of inspiration and implies conscious effort rather than natural development. The effect of this is twofold: the profusion of epithets in itself evokes the traditional epic style, while at the same time it

[27] All the examples examined here are in the nominative case. The figures for the 13 Homeric names (Αἴας, Ἕκτωρ, Ἥρη; Ἀθήνη, Ἀπόλλων, Ἀχιλλεύς, Ὀδυσσεύς; Αἰνείας, Σαρπηδών, Ἥφαιστος, Πάτροκλος; Ἰδομενεύς, Μηριόνης) are Parry's (cf. 1971: 34-35); the others are mine. They are based on 10 names from Apollonius (Ἥρη, Ὀρφεύς, Φινεύς, Κύπρις; Ἀθήνη, Ἀπόλλων, Ἰήσων; Αἰήτης, Μήδεια; Αἰσονίδης) and 16 names from Vergil (*Dido*, *Iuno*, *Mnestheus*, *Pallas*, *Turnus*; *Acestes*, *Achates*, *Achilles*, *Apollo*, *Iuturna*, *Latinus*; *Aeneas*, *Anchises*, *Evandrus*; *Ascanius*, *Euryalus*).

[28] Jason is called by his patronymic twice as often (80 times) as by his name (40 times); Medea is called by her name less than half the time (29 : 27).

[29] See Worstbrock (1963: 168).

encourages the formation of repeated patterns. If therefore under metrical constraint epithets easily combine with nouns to create phrases of formulaic appearance, it is a phenomenon that ultimately derives from the decision to imitate not so much the formulae as the very frequency of epithetic words in Homer.

2. *Complex Epithets*

In Homer epithets and patronymics often combine to fill a whole verse, e.g. Ἀτρείδη κύδιστε, ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν, Ἀγάμεμνον (*Il.* 2.434, etc.). Vergil imitates this in a line of his own:

a*t Messapus equum domitor, Neptunia proles* (7.691, 9.523)
e*t Messapus equum domitor, Neptunia proles* (12.128)

Fragments of this line, however, also appear elsewhere. The phrase *equum domitor* (an obvious translation of ἱππόδαμος) is used also of Picus and Lausus (7.189, 651); other parts recur in Book 10:

10.353 Auruncaeque manus, subit et *Neptunia proles*,
insignis *Messapus equ*is.

Finally, in 12.550 the first half of the line (*et Messapus equum domitor*) is joined with the formula *et fortis Asilas*, repeated from 12.127, where it had preceded the last occurrence of the complete line. On occasions like these Vergil appears to be imitating Homer's practice of combining formulae like building blocks to make a hexameter.

Other examples are less long, but as a rule they involve more than one attribute or epithet. Homer and Ennius provide the models for the following:[30]

divum pater atque hominum rex/ (1.65, 2.648, 10.2, 743)
hominum sator atque deorum/ (12.254, 11.725)

But often the Homeric archetype is much less certain:

10.1 panditur *interea* domus *omnipotentis Olympi*[31]
12.791 Iunonem *interea* rex *omnipotentis Olympi*
2.779 fas aut *ille* sin*it* super*i regnator Olympi*[32]

[30] The first comes directly from Ennius (*Ann.* 175, cf. also *Ann.* 580, 581), but both phrases ultimately go back to Homer's very common πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε (*Il.* 1.544, etc.).

[31] A possible Homeric parallel to *omnipotentis Olympi* could be Οὐλύμποιο πολυπτύχου (*Il.* 20.5). Though the two are different in meaning, Prof. Knauer has pointed out to me that they are metrically equivalent (8 syllables each) and both occur in a *concilium deorum.* More likely the phrase derives from a lost Latin epic formula (perhaps Ennian), or else Vergil has combined two expressions of Ennius, *pater optime Olympi* (*Ann.* 192) and *Iovis omnipotentis* (*Ann.* 458), transferring Jupiter's omnipotence to Olympus.

[32] Naevius has *summe deum regnator* (fr. 15 Morel).

7.558 *haud* pater *ille* vel*it summi regnator Olympi*
10.437 *haud* tamen inter se magn*i regnator Olympi*
4.230 Italiam regeret, *genus alto a sanguine Teucri*
proderet,
5.45 Dardanidae magni, *genus alto a sanguine* divum[33]
6.500 Deiphobe armipotens, *genus alto a sanguine Teucri*

fluvio Tiberinus amoeno/ (7.30, 8.31)[34]
Troiae sub moenibus altis/ (1.95, 3.322, 10.469, cf. 5.624)
Latio et Laurentibus agris/ (11.431, 12.24 *arvis* M).

3. *Combinations of Characters*

Two or more characters may be joined to make a formulaic line or phrase:

8.521 *Aeneas* Anchisiade*s et fidus Achates*
8.586 *Aeneas* INTER primo*s et fidus Achates*
12.384 INTERea *Aenea*n Mnestheu*s et fidus Achates*
1.510 An*thea Sergestumque* vid*et fortemque* Cloan*thum*
4.288 Mnes*thea Sergestumque* voc*at fortemque* Seres*tum* (= 12.561)

Mnestheus acerque Serestus/ (9.171, 779, 12.549).

Such combinations are, of course, standard Homeric practice:

Il. 17.754 Αἰνείας τ' Ἀγχισιάδης καὶ φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ
Il. 14.425 Πουλυδάμας τε καὶ Αἰνείας καὶ δῖος Ἀγήνωρ.

The pattern may of course also involve nations and cities:

6.891 *Laurent*isque docet populo*s urbemque Latini*
12.137 *Laurent*um Troumque acie*s urbemque Latini.*

Although there is considerable flexibility, variation generally does not disrupt the established pattern of a line or phrase, which suggests that its cause is not avoidance of repetition but experimentation. The following assortment of hemistichs provides an illustration:

7.43 *Tyrrhenamque manum tot*amque sub arma coactam
Hesperiam.
11.450 *Tyrrhenamque manum tot*is descendere campis
11.93 *Tyrrhenique* omnes ET VersIS ARCADES ARMIS
11.171 *Tyrrhenique duces*, Tyrrhenum *exercitus omnis*
11.598 Etrusc*ique duces* equit*um*que *exercitus omnis*

[33] Cf. Ennius *Ann.* 113: *o sanguen dis oriundum.* Norden (on 6.500) believes that the phrase is borrowed from early Latin poetry.

[34] Eden (on 8.31) suggests that here Vergil may be trying to devise an equivalent to ἐύρροος or καλλίρροος.

11.835 *Tyrrhenique duces EVANDRIQUE ARCADES ALAE*
12.123 *Tyrrhen*us*que* ruit VariIS *exercitus* ARMIS
12.281 Troes Agyll*inique* ET pictIS ARCADES ARMIS
12.551 Tuscorumque phalanx *EVANDRIQUE ARCADES ALAE*

4. *Descriptions of Characters*

Unlike epithets, longer descriptions of characters are not necessarily decorative, but repetition or traditional language often makes them seem so:

4.481 ultimus Aethiopum locus est, *ubi* maximus *Atlas*
axem umero torquet stellis ardentibus aptum:
6.796 extra anni solisque vias, *ubi* caelifer *Atlas*
axem umero torquet stellis ardentibus aptum.
11.201 nox umida donec
invertit caelum *stellis ardentibus aptum.*

The repeated hemistich is Ennian.[35] The mention of Atlas invariably evokes the image of the starry sky he supports on his mighty shoulders, an image expressed by a traditional formula and associated with his name as if it were almost an epithet.

The following line appears twice in the *Aeneid*, describing first Aeneas (1.313) and then Turnus (12.165):

bina manu lato crispans hastilia ferro.

Many heroes in Homer carry two spears (e.g. Agamemnon in *Il.* 11.43, Odysseus in *Od.* 22.125), but only Paris (*Il.* 3.18-19) brandishes his two spears.[36] Because the duel between Aeneas and Turnus is modeled after the duel between Menelaos and Paris in *Iliad* 3, it is easy to understand how this particular detail was retained in Book 12,[37] but in Book 1 there is no need for Aeneas to be brandishing his spears as he walks alongside Achates. The line could be merely decorative there, though it is noteworthy that the verse once applied to Paris should describe only Aeneas and Turnus, both of whom are at various times compared to Paris.

The description of Turnus in the catalogue:

7.783 *ipse* inter primos praestanti corpore Turnus
vertitur in mediis *et toto vertice supra est*,

[35] See Ennius *Ann.* 29: *qui caelum versat stellis fulgentibus aptum* (also *Ann.* 159, 339, 211). The formula is apparently derived from the Homeric καὶ οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα (*Il.* 19.128, etc.). Cf. Lucr. 6.357 and Austin on 6.797.

[36] Knauer (1964: 59 n1) explains the unusual *crispans* (only here in all of Vergil) as a translation of πάλλων.

[37] See Knauer (1964: 292-93, 425-27).

and that of Etruscan Ornytus:

11.682 *ipse* catervis
vertitur arma tenens *et toto vertice supra est*,

may derive from the description of Ajax in *Il.* 3.227, but there is no ostensible reason why both should be depicted this way. It seems that the Homeric verse, which is not repeated elsewhere, is treated by Vergil as if it were an epic formula.

Besides phrases taken directly from Homer or Ennius there are also many analogical formations that support the decorative effect of the other formulae. Some of the repetitions may arise naturally, such as when a character is introduced a second time:

7.803 hos super advenit *Volsca de gente Camilla*
agmen agens equitum et florentis aere catervas,
11.432 est et *Volsc*orum egregia *de gente Camilla*
agmen agens equitum et florentis aere catervas.

But often we find the same expression applied to different characters:

5.68 aut *iaculo* incedit melior *levibusque sagittis*,
9.177 Hyrtacides, comitem Aeneae quem miserat Ida
venatrix *iaculo* celerem *levibusque sagittis.*
9.572 hic *iaculo* bonus, hic *longe fallente sagitta*,
10.753 at Thronium Salius Saliumque Nealces
insidiis, *iaculo* ET *longe fallente sagitta.*[38]

The emphasis is not on the individual attributes of the heroes, but on qualities they share with all who are good archers or spear-fighters. At one point this quality is transferred to the ship of Aeneas when Cymodocea propels it over the waves:

10.247 fugit illa per undas
ocior et *iaculo* ET ventos aequa*nte sagitta.*

Similar backgrounds of Mezentius and Metabus, the father of Camilla, lead to similar language:

10.852 *pulsus ob invidiam* solio sceptr*isque* patern*is*
11.539 *pulsus ob invidiam* regno v*irisque* sup*erbas*
Priverno antiqua Metabus cum excederet urbe,

[38] Most editors read *insidiis*, which has greater MS authority than *insignis* (*M*, Ti. Don.; followed by Heyne, Con., Hirtzel), although the former leaves the sense of the line less clear (cf. Con. *ad loc.*). Presumably the dart and arrow refer to weapons used by Salius and Nealces in their stealthy attacks.

yet there is something universal about the *invidia* that brings them down. Anius and Haemonides are both priests of Apollo, the fillets binding their temples are emblems of their office:

3.80 rex Anius, rex idem hominum *Phoebique sacerdos*
*vitt*is et *sacra redimit*us *tempora* lauro
occurrit;

10.537 nec procul Haemonides, *Phoebi* Trivia*eque sacerdos*,
infula cui *sacra redimi*bat *tempora vitta*.

One priest is like another. Similarly, the parallels between the Cyclops and Fama:

3.658 *monstrum horrendum*, informe, *ingens*, *cui* lumen ademptum
4.181 *monstrum horrendum*, *ingens*, *cui* quot sunt corpore plumae...

are perhaps meant to suggest a generic likeness that the two share as embodiments of universal *furor*.

B. *Action, Circumstance, and Narrative*

From characters we now turn to their deeds and their environment. Here again repeated phrases abound, some deriving from Homeric or Ennian models, while others appear to be Vergilian creations. In the previous chapter (pp. 63-66) we have already had occasion to discuss one of the most common forms of epic repetition: beginnings and endings of speeches. Considering the number of speeches in the poem, it is not surprising that Vergil chose to vary his expressions more than usual. He probably felt that in this case repetition would have been too obvious and pointless. The examples to be considered here involve less common but still fairly typical events or situations, which Homer would generally have expressed through formulae. Although we are not, as in Homer, dealing with 'typical scenes', repetition often succeeds in making them seem typical.[39]

1. *Prayer and Sacrifice*

The language of these formulae may be traditional, in which case repetition would be appropriate, for it suggests that the ritual is being faithfully executed:

4.219 *talibus or*antem *dictis arasque tene*ntem[40]
6.124 *talibus or*abat *dictis arasque tene*bat

[39] On the question of typical scenes in Homer see Arend (1933).
[40] Cf. the Homeric ὣς ἔφατ' εὐχόμενος (*Il.* 1.43, etc.).

4.57 exquirunt; *mactant lectas de more bidentis*[41]
5.96 caedit bin*as de more bidentis*
totque sues, *TOTIDEM* NIGRANTIS TERGA IUVENCOS
6.38 nunc grege de intacto septem *mact*are IUVENCOS
praestiterit, *TOTIDEM lectas* ex *more bidentis*
6.243 quattuor hic primum NIGRANTIS TERGA IUVENCOS
8.544 laetus adit; *mactat lectas de more bidentis*
5.743 haec memorans *cinerem et sopitos suscitat ignis*
8.410 impositum, *cinerem et sopitos suscitat ignis*
8.542 et primum Herculeis *sopitas ign*ibus aras
ex*citat*
8.284 dona fer*unt cumulantque oneratis lancibus aras*
11.199 IN FLAMMAM IUGULANT PECUDES. tum litore toto
12.214 IN FLAMMAM IUGULANT PECUDES et viscera vivis
eripi*unt, cumulantque oneratis lancibus aras.*

2. *Battle*

For Homer the battle-field offers many occasions to use epic formulae. In Vergil there are several striking examples, but he is exceedingly eclectic in what he chooses to imitate, often combining elements from various sources to fashion his lines. The two-line description of dying Orodes:

10.745 *olli dura quies oculos et ferreus urget*
somnus, *in aeternam* c*lauduntur lumina noctem*,

is later applied to Alsus:

12.309 *olli dura quies oculos et ferreus urget*
somnus, *in aeternam* c*onduntur lumina noctem*.

Its indebtedness to Homeric formulae that describe how death (*Il.* 5.82-83, etc.; *Il.* 16.502-503) or dark night (*Il.* 5.310 = 11.356; 5.659, etc.) covers the fallen hero's eyes is rather slight, for the euphemistic *dura quies* replaces death, while the last line may be closer to Catullus than Homer.[42] But even more remarkable is *ferreus somnus*, which comes from a unique Homeric expression (χάλκεον ὕπνον, *Il.* 11.241).[43] There is no reason to suspect a connection between Orodes and Alsus; it seems that Vergil is merely repeating his new formula for its decorative effect.

[41] Further discussion of these formulae in Pease (on 4.57) and Norden (on 6.38, 243), who believes that there may be Ennian influence. Cf. Lucr. 3.52-53: *et nigras mactant pecudes et manibus divis/ inferias mittunt.*
[42] Cf. Cat. 5.6 (*nox...perpetua*) and 51.11-12: *gemina teguntur lumina nocte.*
[43] Also relevant here is Ennius' *fit ferreus imber* (*Ann.* 284).

Macrobius (*Sat.* 6.3.1) notes how the description of Ajax' desperate stand against the Trojans:

Il. 16.109 αἰεὶ δ' ἀργαλέῳ ἔχετ' ἄσθματι, κὰδ δέ οἱ ἱδρὼς
πάντοθεν ἐκ μελέων πολὺς ἔρρεεν, οὐδέ πῃ εἶχεν
ἀμπνεῦσαι,

is taken over by Ennius when he describes the tribune Caelius battling against the Istri:

Ann. 405 semper abundantes hastas frangitque *quatit*que.
TOTum SUDOR habet CORPus, multumque laborat,
NEC RESPIRAndi fit copia: praepete ferro
Histri tela manu iacientes sollicitabant.

Vergil in turn draws on both in the passage where Turnus barely fights his way out of the Trojan camp:

9.812 tum TOTo CORPore SUDOR
liquitur et piceum (NEC RESPIRAre potestas)
flumen agit, fess*os quatit aeger anhelitus artus.*

One phrase, however, which also appears twice in Book 5, seems to have become formulaic:

5.198 *VASTIS* trem*it* ictibus aerea puppis
subtrahiturque solum, tum creb*er anhelitus artus*
aridaque ora *quatit*, SUDOR fluit undique rivis

5.432 genua labant, *VASTos quatit aeger anhelitus artus.*

The following examples further illustrate how Vergilian expressions sometimes congeal into fairly fixed metrical patterns:

2.511 cingitur, ac densos *fer*tur *moriturus in hostis*

9.400 eripere? an sese *medios moriturus in* ense*s*
INferaT ET PULCHRAM proPEReT PER VULNERA MORTEM

9.554 haud aliter iuvenis *medios moriturus in hostis*
INruiT ET qua tela videt densissima tendit

11.647 certantes PULCHRAMque PEtunT PER VULNERA MORTEM
(= *G* 4.218)

9.410 dixerat et *toto conixus corpore* FERr*um*
10.127 FERt ingens *toto conixus corpore* saxum

9.569 Ilioneus *saxo atque ingenti fragmine montis*
10.698 sed Latagum *saxo atque ingenti fragmine montis*
12.531 praecipitem *s*copul*o atque ingenti*s turb*ine saxi*

9.578 ad vulnus tulit; ergo *alis adlapsa sagitta*
12.319 ecce viro stridens *alis adlapsa sagitta* est

9.763 excip*it*, hinc *raptas fugientibus ingerit hastas*
12.330 proter*it* aut *raptas fugientibus ingerit hastas*

10.645 instat cui Turnus *stridentemque eminus hastam*
coni*cit*
10.776 'Aeneae.' dixit, *stridentemque eminus hastam*
ie*cit*

4.579 'dextra feras.' dixit *vaginaque eripit ensem*
10.896 advolat Aeneas *vaginaque eripit ensem.*

3. *Sea*

Homer's accounts of the various activities connected with seafaring are usually detailed and highly repetitive.[44] On the other hand, Apollonius in the first book of the *Argonautica* dismisses arrivals and departures with a few words, except in the more significant episodes.[45] This corresponds to what has already been observed about his descriptions of dawns and nights (see above, pp. 66-72). He has a seemingly inexhaustible supply of variants, whereas Vergil, though avoiding the redundancy of the Homeric descriptions, does not at all seem averse to repetition:

3.130 *prosequitur surgens a puppi ventus euntis*[46]
et tandem anti*quis Curetum adlabimur oris.*

5.777 *prosequitur surgens a puppi ventus euntis*
6.2 *et tandem* Eubo*icis* C*umarum adlabi*tur *oris,*

3.208 *adnixi torquent spumas et caerula verrunt.*[47]
= 4.583

3.277 *ancora de prora iacitur, stant litore puppes.*[48]
= 6.901

3.290 *certatim socii feriunt mare et aequora verrunt.*[49]
= 5.778

---

[44] E.g. *Od.* 2.416 = 3.12, 2.420-26 = 15.287-92, 4.425-30 = 4.570-75, 4.577-78 = 11.2-3, 4.580 = 9.104, 4.780-83 = 8.51-54, 5.268 = 7.266, 9.62-63 = 9.565-66, 9.77 = 12.402, 9.103-104 = 471-72 = 563-64, 9.105 = 12.147, 9.150-51 = 12.6-7, 9.177-79 = 15.547-49, 9.482-84 = 539-41, 9.488-89 = 10.128-29, 9.562-64 = 12.145-47, 10.1 = 135, 11.6-10 = 12.148-52. Cf. also Arend (1933: 79-86).

[45] The departure from Iolkos is given a fairly detailed description (*Arg.* 1.559-68), as are the arrival and departure flanking the Lemnian episode (1.605-608, 910-14), and the arrival among the Doliones with the subsequent departure and return at night (1.953-57, 1012-1020). Also given more detailed treatment is the episode where Heracles breaks his oar (1.1152-69) and the later departure of the heroes without Heracles (1.1252-79).

[46] Cf. *Od.* 11.6-7 = 12.148-49.

[47] Cf. *Od.* 12.171-72 (unique in Homer); Ennius *Ann.* 384-85; and Wigodsky (1972: 49-50).

[48] Cf. *Il.* 1.436 = *Od.* 15.498.

[49] Cf. *Od.* 9.104 = 12.147, etc. (a common formula); Ennius *Ann.* 384-85.

3.429 praestat Trinacrii *metas* lustrare Pachyni
cessantem, *longos et circumflectere cursus*,

5.129 hic viridem Aeneas frondenti ex ilice *metam*
constituit signum nautis pater, unde reverti
scirent *et longos* ubi *circumflectere cursus*.

3.471 *remigi*um supple*t*, *socios simul instruit armis*.[50]
8.80 *remigi*oque apta*t*, *socios simul instruit armis*.

5.143 = 8.690 *convulsum remis rostrisque tridentibus aequor*.

5.157 *Centaurus*, nunc una ambae iunctisque feruntur
frontibus *et longa sulcan*t vada *salsa carina*.

10.195 ingentem remis *Centaurum* promovet: ille
instat aquae saxumque undis immane minatur
arduus, *et longa sulcat* maria *alta carina*.

6.302 *ipse* rate*m* conto subi*git velisque ministrat*
10.218 *ipse* se*d*ens clavumque re*git velisque ministrat*.

3.192 postquam altum *tenuere rates nec iam amplius ullae*
apparent terrae, *caelum undique et undique* pontus,
tum mihi *caeruleus supra caput astitit imber*
noctem hiememque ferens, et inhorruit unda tenebris.[51]

5.8 ut pelagus *tenuere rates nec iam amplius ulla*
occurrit tellus, maria *undique et undique caelum*
olli *caeruleus supra caput astitit imber*
noctem hiememque ferens et inhorruit unda tenebris.

Seafaring formulae in the *Aeneid* deserve further study. The number of repetitions is unusual, as is the degree to which they depend on Homeric models. Both contribute to the poem's formulaic texture, although these lines, like some of the repeated dawns and nights (see below, pp. 161-62 and note 61), may conceivably emphasize theme and structure.

4. *Nature and Artifact*

Descriptions are less likely to be formulaic than epithets or actions, unless they describe what is deeply imbedded in tradition. The dawns and nights discussed in the last chapter (pp. 66-72) are good examples of such traditional language; the song of Iopas provides another one:

1.744 *Arcturum pluviasque Hyadas geminosque Triones* (= 3.516),

[50] Cf. *Od.* 2.422-23 = 15.287-88.

[51] Cf. *Od.* 12.403-406 = 14.301-304 (Cretan tale of Odysseus). Vergil imitates these Homeric storms very closely; for their structural significance in both works see Knauer (1964: 186-87 and note 2).

for already Homer (*Il.* 18.486-87) and Hesiod (*Op.* 615) have similar lists of constellations. Some repetition will of course occur whenever an object is described a second time, such as the *palla* Aeneas gives to Dido:

1.648 ferre iubet, *pallam* signis auroque rigentem
et circumtex*tum croceo velamen acantho*,

1.709 mirantur dona Aeneae, mirantur Iulum,
flagrantisque dei vultus simulataque verba,
*pallam*que *et* pic*tum croceo velamen acantho*.

But Vergil could easily have altered the line further, yet he chose not to, for the repetition adds epic color and singles out the gift on which everyone's attention was fixed. An even more striking repetition occurs in Book 5, where almost the identical line is applied to the crater Cisseus had given to Anchises and the horse Dido had given to Ascanius:

5.538 ferr*e sui dederat monimentum et pignus amoris*
5.572 *esse sui dederat monimentum et pignus amoris*.

Whatever Vergil's purpose here, a line repeated after so short an interval will always ring formulaic. The other examples occur farther apart, but the repetitions are too long to be attributed solely to chance or similar subject matter:

3.467 *loricam consertam hamis auroque trilicem*
5.259 levibus huic *hamis consertam auroque trilicem*
loricam,

7.639 ad iuga cogit equos, clipeumque *auroque trilicem*
loricam induitur,

5.37 horridus in iacul*is et pelle Libystidis ursae*
8.368 effultum foli*is et pelle Libystidis ursae*,

5.267 cymbiaque *argento perfecta atque aspera signis*
9.263 bina dabo *argento perfecta atque aspera signis*
pocula,

7.565 Amsancti *valles*; *densis* hunc *frondibus atrum*
urget utrimque latus nemori*s*,

11.522 est curvo anfractu *valles*, accommoda fraudi
armorumque dolis, quam *densis frondibus atrum*
urget utrimque latus, tenui*s* quo semita ducit....

5. *Action and Reaction*

The various examples included here fall roughly into two groups, depending on whether they occur in the narrative or in speeches. The latter express sentiments that normally have no place in the narrative, while they differ from rhetorical repetition and quotations (see below,

pp. 108-110) in that the characters seem unaware that they are repeating something. This does not preclude the possibility that some lines may be referential, but the degree to which they rely on Homeric models suggests that their main function is decorative. A fairly common formula in Homer (*Il.* 1.297 = *Od.* 11.454, etc.; cf. Enn. *Ann.* 198) reappears in Vergil as

3.250 *accipite ergo animis atque haec mea figite dicta* (Celaeno)
10.104 *accipite ergo animis atque haec mea figite dicta* (Jupiter)
5.304 *accipite* haec *animis* laetas*que* advert*ite* mentes. (Aeneas)

When Entellus wishes he were young again:

5.397 *si mihi quae quondam fuerat quaque* improbus iste
exsultat fidens, si nunc foret illa iuventas,

he expresses a typically Nestorian thought (*Il.* 23.629 = 7.157 = 11.670). Later, when Juno laments her lack of influence with Jupiter, Vergil transposes the formula to the new context:

10.613 *si mihi, quae quondam fuerat quam*que esse decebat,
vis in amore foret, non hoc mihi namque negares.

Finally, a single Iliadic expression (*Il.* 24.197) seems to have produced a Vergilian formula:

1.582 nate dea, *quae nunc animo sententia surgit?* (Achates)
9.191 quid dubitem ET *quae nunc animo sententia surgat.* (Nisus)
5.748 edocet ET *quae nunc animo sententia* constet. (narrative)

The repetitions in the narrative embrace a wider range of activity and illustrate more fully how Vergil uses the epic tradition:

1.559 talibus Ilioneus; *cuncti simul ore fremebant*
Dardanidae.

5.385 'ducere dona iube.' *cuncti simul ore fremebant*
Dardanidae reddique viro promissa iubebant.

2.58 pastores magno ad regem clam*ore* trah*ebant*
Dardanidae,

11.132 dixerat haec unoque OMNES eadem*o re fremebant.*

A similar phrase may have occurred in Ennius (cf. *Ann.* 586 emended by Vahlen), but the ultimate source is to be found in Homer: πάντες ἐπευφήμησαν Ἀχαιοὶ ... (*Il.* 1.22 = 376) and πάντες ἐπίαχον υἷες Ἀχαιῶν (*Il.* 7.403 = 9.50). Sometimes a single Homeric formula gives rise to a series of repetitions in Vergil, such as the account of the fear Ajax or Achilles inspired in the Trojans (*Il.* 7.215 = 20.44): Τρῶας δὲ τρόμος αἰνὸς ὑπήλυθε γυῖα ἕκαστον, which is imitated twice, but applied to the enemies of the Trojans:

2.120 obstipuere a*nimi gelidusque per ima cucurrit*
ossa tremor, cui fata parent, quem poscat Apollo.

12.447 videre Auson*ii*, *gelidusque per ima cucurrit*
ossa tremor.

The general pattern prevails even when the formula undergoes some variation:

6.54 conticuit. *gelidus* Teucris *per* du*ra cucurrit*
ossa tremor, funditque preces rex pectore ab *imo*:

11.296 vix ea legati, var*ius*que *per* o*ra cucurrit*
Ausonidum turbat*a* f*remor*,

and finally the formula for chilling fear metamorphoses into one describing the heat of passion:

8.390 intravIT cal*or* ET lAbEFACTA *per OSSa cucurrit*,
12.66 subiecIT rub*or* ET cAlEFACTA *per* O*ra cucurrit.*

More often, however, Vergil combines several Homeric lines, as in the couplet describing Aeneas' anxiety (4.285-86 = 8.20-21):

atque animum nunc huc celerem nunc dividit illuc
in partisque rapit varias perque omnia versat.

It draws on a number of passages from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, notably διάνδιχα μερμήριξεν (*Il.* 1.189 = 8.167 = 13.455) and δίχα θυμὸς ὀρώρεται ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα (*Od.* 19.524), as well as on Apollonius and Lucretius.[52]
Parts of the couplet recur elsewhere:

4.630 haec ait, et *partis animum versa*bat *in omnis*,
5.701 *nunc huc* ingentis, *nunc illuc* pectore curas
mutabat *versans*,
10.680 haec memorans *animo nunc huc*, *nunc fluctuat illuc*,

the last being a conflation of the formula and its preceding line in Book 8:

8.19 CUNCTA VIDENS magno curarum *fluctuat* aestu,
atque *animum nunc huc* celerem *nunc* dividit *illuc....*

Occasionally repetitions evolve from unique Homeric passages, such as the description of how Eris from small beginnings grows until with her

[52] For other Homeric formulations see *Il.* 10.4, 14.20-21, 16.435, *Od.* 16.73, and Arend (1933: 106-115). Cf. also Ap. Rhod. *Arg.* 3.758-59, who compares Medea's anxiety to a sunbeam dancing back and forth (ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα), and Lucr. 2.129-31, where the image of motes darting in a sunbeam illustrates the movement of atoms:

multa VIDEBIS enim plagis ibi percita caecis
commutare viam retroque repulsa re*vert*i
nunc huc nunc illuc in CUNCTAS undique *partis.*

The latter seems particularly influential in *A* 8.19-20 (see below).

head she strikes heaven (*Il.* 4.442-43). This becomes the model for the Vergilian Fama:

4.176 parva metu primo, mox sese attollit in auras
ingrediturque solo et caput inter nubila condit,

and later for Orion:

10.766 aut summis referens annosam montibus ornum
ingrediturque solo et caput inter nubila condit.[53]

But frequently the source of Vergil's inspiration is much less clear. The account of how Apollo takes possession of the Sibyl:

6.101 concut*it et stimulos sub pectore vertit* Apollo

is echoed later when Mars rouses the Latins against the Trojans:

9.717 hic Mars armipotens animum virisque Latinis
addidit *et stimulos* acris *sub pectore vertit.*

In the *Iliad* there are many scenes where gods spur on one side or the other, such as when Zeus inspires Patroclus (16.691) or when Athena instils strength and courage into Menelaus (17.569-70), but Vergil's metaphor owes more to the amatory tradition (cf. Anacr. 4 D., Eur. *Hipp.* 39, Lucr. 4.1215). Similarly removed from the Vergilian description of galloping horses,

8.596 *quadriped*ante *putrem* sonit*u quatit ungula campum*
11.875 *quadriped*umque *putrem* curs*u quatit ungula campum,*

is the comparable Homeric line:

Il. 10.535 ἵππων μ' ὠκυπόδων ἀμφὶ κτύπος οὔατα βάλλει.

Here again Vergil draws more on Ennius and Lucretius, combining elements from various passages to produce an onomatopoetic effect rivaling Homer's.[54]

The loss of much early Latin poetry probably causes us both to undervalue and overestimate its role in the development of Vergil's epic style, attributing greater significance to Greek models because the Roman have perished, while making more than we should of the fragments we have. Thus certainty often eludes our attempts to pinpoint the literary influences that have shaped specific lines, but having examined a fair number of what might be called 'decorative' repetitions we can make a few general obser-

[53] Cf. Knauer (1964: 210 n3).

[54] See Ennius *Ann.* 277: *summo sonitu quatit ungula terram* (cf. also *Ann.* 224, 439) and for a more general parallel Lucr. 2.327-30. Lucretius has *quadripedumque* (4.1265), which already occurs in Ennius (*Sc.* 184, 190, cf. *Ann.* 232). For a discussion see Wigodsky (1972: 44-45).

vations. Vergil aims primarily at conveying the essence of epic language and style, rather than constructing a facsimile thereof. He does so by reproducing some of the Homeric and Ennian formulae, and he further enhances the effect through numerous repetitions of his own. These are often remarkable adaptations that manage to combine several Greek and Roman models, suggesting subtle memory, judicious selection, careful composition; and therefore intent. This is not to say that all the repetitions are deliberate or conscious, for subconscious association of words, sounds, and metrical shapes plays an important role in the expansion of old patterns and the creation of new. But such tendencies alone would not produce so many repetitions. Milman Parry recognized this, for he comments on the difficulty of writing formulaic verse: "we must see, if we are to understand the poet [Vergil], how much toil these repetitions must have cost him" (1971: 300). What we have then is a deliberate effort to imitate the texture of traditional epic verse. Yet while Vergil affects such a style, relatively few of his repetitions derive from a single epic formula, for he prefers to develop them from unique Homeric lines or from elements of several formulae.[55] Vergil chose to repeat, but he did so in a manner that reveals his literary heritage, while affirming his originality and poetic skill.

C. *Emphasis and Continuity*

This last category represents a development of the decorative function to the point where it emphasizes certain aspects of the poem, though without necessarily contributing to the overall structure or the interpretation of specific scenes in relation to others. There is, of course, a degree of arbitrariness in the classification, since it is often difficult to decide whether a repetition is emphatic or referential.

In its simplest form such repetition is akin to anaphora, using repeated words and phrases to stress the similarity or continuity of events in relatively short narrative sequences. This may be attained through mere imitation of sound patterns, as in the description of the storm in Book 1, which starts with the winds rushing forth upon the sea:

1.84 *incubuere* mari totumque a sedibus imis,

[55] This practice parallels the *dédoublement* and *contaminatio* of scenes and characters already observed by Knauer. A good instance of *contaminatio* is the fusion of the deaths of Sarpedon and Patroclus in the description of the death of Pallas (Knauer 1964: 298-301). The contrary phenomenon, *dédoublement,* occurs when the single character Elpenor becomes the model for three Vergilian characters: Palinurus, Misenus, and Caieta (1964: 137 n1, 147, 203-204, 208, 314, 336).

and then continues:

1.90 *intonuēre* poli͡ ét crebris micat ignibus aether.[56]

By juxtaposing the initial attack of the winds with the ensuing thunder and lightning, these echoes mark the development of the storm and set the churning sea against the chaotic sky. Very close to anaphora is the emphatic *abnegat* at verse beginning (2.637, 654) that punctuates the stubborn refusal of Anchises to leave Troy. In the funeral procession of Pallas *homoeoteleuton* and repeated sound patterns join the grief of Acoetes:

11.86 pectora nunc foed*áns* pugn*ís*, nunc u*nguibus óra*,

with that of the horse Aethon:

11.90 it lacrim*áns* gutt*ís*que umectat gra*ndibus óra*,

thereby intensifying the feeling of universal loss at the death of Pallas.

This universalizing aspect is an important part of emphatic repetition, and it functions in much the same way as a traditional heroic epithet that is applied to a man, not to single out some individual trait, but rather to put him in the same class with all the other bearers of that epithet. A good illustration of this may be found in the recurring theme of *praematura mors*—of youth cut down before its prime.[57] Pallas is the example that immediately comes to mind, but the same tragic destiny also awaits Lausus, Euryalus, and Marcellus. Several repetitions contribute to the effectiveness of this theme. In Book 6, after crossing the Styx and getting safely past Cerberus, Aeneas hears the wailing of infants whom bitter death had snatched from the very threshold of life:

6.429 *abstulit atra dies et funere mersit acerbo.*

Aeneas echoes this line in his lament over Pallas:

11.27 quem non virtutis egentem
abstulit atra dies et funere mersit acerbo.

[56] Cf. Austin on 1.90, and for anaphora his note on 1.78.

[57] "Les jeunes gens n'existent chez Virgile que pour tomber sous les coups du destin; ... leur raison d'être est avant tout la mélancolie de leur mort" (Guillemin 1951: 202, cf. also 289-91). Raabe (1974: 117-22, 228-31) focuses primarily on the heroic nobility of youthful victims, disregarding that often their motives are flawed and their deaths futile, for which see Boyle (1972: 78-81, 123-25, 133-36). W. R. Johnson (1976: 106-111) stresses both pathos and grandeur, two visions of life without a comforting synthesis. This tension between cosmic optimism and individual tragedy, between historical achievement and its cost, has been sensitively explored by Perret (1967), Segal (1965, 1966: 34-74), and Brooks (1953), who sees the golden bough in Book 6 as "the primary symbol of this splendid despair" (p. 280). Cf. Clausen (1964: 146): "it is this perception of Roman history as a long Pyrrhic victory of the human spirit that makes Virgil his country's truest historian."

Untimely death and physical beauty distinguish the tragic young. When Pallas sets out with Aeneas to join the Etruscan force near Caere, he is likened to Lucifer rising out of the ocean (8.589-91), and in death his beauty is compared to that of a freshly plucked flower (11.68-71).[58] Not much different is the simile, borrowed from *Iliad* 8.306-307 and Catullus 11.22-24, describing the death of Euryalus (9.435-37), who earlier had been called the most beautiful of all the Trojans:

9.179 et *iuxta* comes Eurya*lus*, *quo pulchrior alter*
non fuit Aeneadum Troiana neque induit arma,

which in turn recalls Lausus:

7.649 filius huic *iuxta* Laus*us*, *quo pulchrior alter*
non fuit excepto Laurentis corpore Turni.

Lausus and Euryalus are analogous types. Their beauty matches their love and devotion, which ultimately lead them to ruin.[59] Euryalus will not let Nisus go alone on a dangerous mission, but his love for Nisus is flawed by lust for glory and spoils, which in the end compromises their undertaking and betrays them. Lausus, on the other hand, dying in an attempt to save his wounded father, figures as an example of filial love. Both, however, inspire self-sacrifice. Mezentius in a vain attempt to kill Aeneas rushes to certain death (*venio moriturus*, 10.881), just as Nisus does when he kills Volcens to avenge Euryalus (*moriens animam abstulit hosti*, 9.443).

Marcellus, too, is endowed with this tragic beauty:

6.860 una namque ire videbat
egregium forma iuvenem et fulgentibus armis,
sed frons laeta parum et deiecto lumina vultu.

There is a generic likeness between him and the Arcadian felled by the spear of Tolumnius:

12.275 *egregium forma iuvenem et fulgentibus armis*,
transadigit costas fulvaque effundit harena.

Marcellus, who represents the greatest hope of the Roman race, is also a symbol of hope's fragility. It is not inappropriate that a similar figure

[58] For an interpretation of the *Lucifer* image see Hornsby (1970: 35-37); on the similes describing the deaths of Euryalus and Pallas see his comments on pp. 32-33, 86-87; and G. Williams (1968: 468-69).

[59] There are Homeric models for both passages. In 7.649-50 Vergil may have thought of the description of Ajax in *Il.* 17.279-80 (= *Od.* 11.550f.), while the Euryalus passage was probably influenced by *Od.* 8.115-17, where a Phaeacian of the same name is described. Yet in Homer this is merely *kalokagathia*, where beauty, courage, and physical strength are complementary manifestations of the same heroic *aretē*. Vergil perceives beauty as either tragic or flawed.

should fall victim to the act that breaks the truce and dashes all hope of preventing further bloodshed between Trojans and Latins.

Aeneas puzzles over the ominous darkness enveloping Marcellus:

6.866 sed *nox atra* caput tristi *circumvolat umbra.*[60]

A similar line had occurred in Book 2 describing the night in whose shade Aeneas and his companions make a desperate stand against the invading Greeks:

2.359 vadimus haud dubiam in mortem mediaeque tenemus
urbis iter; *nox atra cava circumvolat umbra.*

It is conceivable that the verbal similarity is accidental, but not very likely, because *circumvolare* is a rare word.[61] What we have in both cases is an image of impending doom. The Trojans with Aeneas, knowing that everything is lost, resolve to die fighting (2.353), and all except Aeneas perish. It is a nice touch that Marcellus, Rome's brightest hope tragically unfulfilled, should through such repetition be linked with the darkest gloom of Troy's fall, in which case this repetition comes close to being referential.

Very interesting is the repetition which describes the deaths of Camilla (11.831) and Turnus (12.952):

vitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras.

Servius is aware of the repetition and quotes the Homeric model:

ψυχὴ δ' ἐκ ῥεθέων πταμένη Ἄϊδόσδε βεβήκει
ὃν πότμον γοόωσα, λιποῦσ' ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην,

though he does not indicate whether he is thinking of the death of Patroclus (*Il.* 16.856-57) or the death of Hector (*Il.* 22.362-63).[62] This formulaic link between Patroclus and Hector, the slain and the slayer, seems intentional and would certainly have been noticed by Vergil, but he applies it not to Pallas and Turnus, as one might have expected, but to Camilla and Turnus. Knauer (1964: 309-15) showed that Camilla's death

[60] This image is probably Homeric in origin. Clarke suggested as a possible model the vision of Theoclymenus in *Od.* 20.351-52: νυκτὶ μὲν ὑμέων/εἰλύαται κεφαλαί τε πρόσωπά τε νέρθε τε γοῦνα. Whether the same Homeric passage has any bearing on the repetition in 2.360 is questionable. Highet (1972: 203-204) remarks on the repetition, but it is not clear whether he believes it is influenced by the *Odyssey.* Austin (on 6.866) suggests that Vergil may have thought of Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.57-58.

[61] Its only other occurrence is at 3.233.

[62] Cartault (1926: 828) rightly stresses the difference between the Vergilian and Homeric formulations: "chez Homère, la victime regrette la vie, chez Virgile, elle est révoltée du sort qui lui a été infligé." Cf. also Perret (1967: 348-49) for possible reasons why Vergil linked Camilla and Turnus ("Camille est la meilleure part de l'âme de Turnus").

is modeled on that of Patroclus, but it leaves unexplained why Vergil avoided the more obvious connection with Pallas, another Patroclus figure. Segal (1974: 49-50) has suggested that Vergil may have purposely refrained from such a causal pattern so as to attain a more generalized effect, though he admits that the line could emphasize a similarity between Turnus and Camilla, "because both are carried away by violence and greed in the midst of battle and both are killed as a result."

Ascanius, like other youthful heroes, is singled out for his beauty when in Book 5 he leads the Trojan boys in the *lusus Troiae*:

5.570 extremus formaque *ante omnis pulcher Iulus*
Sidonio est invectus equo.

And in Book 7 he is again called *pulcher* on two important occasions—the tables omen (7.107) and the hunt for Silvia's stag (7.477-78). The beauty may be part of his heritage, for in the hunt with Dido it was Aeneas whom this epithet graced (*ante alios pulcherrimus omnis*, 4.141). But neither he, nor Dido (*pulcherrima*, 1.496, 4.60), nor Turnus (*ante alios pulcherrimus omnis*, 7.55) can escape the tragedy and anguish allotted to anyone so marked. Extraordinary beauty is invariably connected with suffering and death. It is a recurring pattern, and one that even Iulus seems to follow. In the initial scenes he is distinguished from his companions by surpassing beauty, but as he grows older he is further characterized by tears beyond the ordinary:

9.292 percussa mente dedere
Dardanidae lacrimas, *ante omnis pulcher Iulus*,

and by cares beyond what is normal for his years:

9.310 nec non et *pulcher Iulus*
ante annos animumque gerens curamque virilem.

In this way the repetition brings out not only a generic trait associated with many youthful figures, but also the spiritual growth of Ascanius, and so it is again partly referential in function.

The model for some of the qualities Ascanius displays is of course Aeneas, whose extraordinary concern for his companions is already established in Book 1, when he laments their presumed death in the storm:

1.220 *praecipue pius Aeneas* nunc acris Oronti,
nunc Amyci casum gemit et crudelia secum
fata Lyci fortemque Gyan fortemque Cloanthum,[63]

[63] The fact that *praecipue* occurs only five times in the *Aeneid* makes the repetition even more emphatic. Another repetition (1.222 = 612) marks the contrast between the grief for his lost companions and the joy of later finding them alive and well (see below, p. 126).

and stressed by a repetition at the death of Misenus:

6.175 ergo omnes magno circum clamore fremebant,
praecipue pius Aeneas.

His profound devotion to his people causes him to feel loss more deeply than anyone else.[64]

Aside from drawing attention to certain qualities, actions, or relations, emphatic repetition may also reveal the irony of a statement or situation. Here again emphatic and referential categories overlap. When Juno urges Juturna to assist her brother, she begins with a lengthy reference to her own affection for the nymph:

12.143 scis ut te cunctis unam, quaecumque Latinae
magnanimi Iovis ingratum ascendere cubile,
praetulerim caelique libens in parte locarim.

The juxtaposition of *ingratum* with *magnanimi*, a traditional epithet suggesting heroic *virtus*, is at least vaguely ironic, although the nature of the ingratitude is not very clear, especially since just before that it was mentioned how Jupiter had rewarded Juturna by making her a goddess:

12.140 hunc illi rex aetheris altus honorem
Iuppiter erepta *pro virginitate* sacravit.

It is only later when the Dira signals to Juturna the inevitability of Turnus' death that the bitter irony of Jupiter's magnanimity becomes fully apparent:

12.877 nec fallunt iussa superba
magnanimi Iovis. haec *pro virginitate* reponit?
quo vitam dedit aeternam? cur mortis adempta est
condicio? possem tantos finire dolores
nunc certe, et misero fratri comes ire per umbras!

The bed of Jupiter is *ingratum* not for the lack of a fitting reward, but because his generosity takes no account of human ties and feelings, so that paradoxically it is transformed into its opposite by making Juturna's anguish coeval with her immortality.

Related to emphatic repetitions are those which tend to provide a sense of continuity between scenes and events. Two instances of this kind of repetition (1.73 = 4.126, 1.124 = 4.160) have already been discussed at the beginning of this chapter (see pp. 75-78). To these we can add a few more.

---

[64] Cf. Austin on 6.176.

As Aeneas madly searches for Creusa in the burning ruins of Troy, her shade appears before him and tries to allay his fears:

2.775 *tum sic adfari et curas his demere dictis,*

revealing her own strange fate and the great future awaiting him. This same introductory line is also repeated before the appearances of the Penates (3.153) and Tiber (8.35).[65] In all these instances Aeneas faces major crises, and each time he gets guidance and reassurance in the form of a nocturnal vision. Thus the three scenes represent significant stages in his progress toward Italy. It is Creusa who first explains the nature of his mission (Hector's instructions had been very vague, offering little information and less comfort), the Penates set him on the right course, and in the end Tiber confirms that he has arrived at his destination. There is sufficient similarity among these scenes[66] that we would associate them even without the repeated formula, and while it provides a further link, its primary function seems to be to emphasize the recurrence of the same soothing mood which accompanies the prophecies like a *leitmotif*.

When at the beginning of Book 9 Turnus attempts to set fire to the Trojan ships, they are miraculously changed into nymphs, and all are dumbfounded and frightened except Turnus:

9.126 at non *audaci Turno fiducia cessit.*

He sees it as a favorable omen, for now the Trojans are trapped (*nec spes ulla fugae*, 9.131). The same undaunted courage and self-confidence of Turnus is again emphasized in Book 10 at the point when Aeneas resplendent in his divine armor arrives at the head of his Etruscan and Arcadian allies:

10.276 haud tamen *audaci Turno fiducia cessit.*

There is some similarity between the two scenes which the repetition helps to bring out, stressing the continued courage of Turnus in the face of

---

[65] Although Servius D. casts doubt on the authenticity of the repetition by noting that in many MSS the line was missing in Books 2 and 3, it is retained in all our MSS and probably is genuine.

[66] The night during which Tiber appears:

8.26 *nox erat et terras animalia* fessa per omnis
alituum pecudumque genus *sopor* alt*us habebat,*

echoes the night when the Penates appeared:

3.147 *nox erat et terris animalia somnus habebat,*

and both the Penates and Tiber urge Aeneas on with *surge age* (3.169 = 8.59).

danger, but also showing his blindness to the real nature of things. His confidence is irrational and his courage based on ignorance.[67]

The same phrase describes the deaths of Acron and Antores:

10.730 *sternitur infelix* Acron et calcibus atram...
10.781 *sternitur infelix* alieno vulnere, caelumque...

Both are Greek allies, both victims of Mezentius, whose continued rampage through the Trojan lines is emphasized by this repetition.

A unique and particularly effective form of emphatic repetition occurs in Aeneas' prayer to Apollo:

3.85 da propriam, Thymbraee, domum; da MOENIA fessis
et genus et mansuram URBEM; serva altera Troiae
Pergama, *reliquias Danaum atque immitis Achilli,*

which echoes the description of Juno's implacable hatred of the Trojans in the proem:

1.26 manet alta mente repostum
iudicium Paridis spretaeque iniuria formae
et genus invisum *et* rapti Ganymedis honores—
his accensa super iactatos aequore toto
Troas, *reliquias Danaum atque immitis Achilli,*[68]
arcebat longe Latio.

The recollection of the proem adds the poet's own voice to the prayer and thereby lends it greater urgency and pathos. It also suggests the ultimate source of Trojan misfortunes—the anger of Juno, who through the Greeks and Achilles had destroyed Troy and would now prevent the founding of Rome.

The lengthy description of how Jupiter shakes all of Olympus when he nods assent to Cybele's request:

9.104 dixerat idque ratum *Stygii per flumina fratris,*
per pice torrentis atraque voragine ripas
adnuit, et totum nutu tremefecit Olympum,

and when he declares his neutrality in the *concilium deorum* in Book 10:

10.113 'fata viam invenient.' *Stygii per flumina fratris,*
per pice torrentis atraque voragine ripas
adnuit, et totum nutu tremefecit Olympum,

[67] Cf. Worstbrock (1963: 93-95).

[68] Cf. *reliquias Danaum* (1.598). Conington on 3.86 also cites 1.5-7 (esp. *urbem, moenia*) as a further parallel.

may be little more than decorative, for it imitates well-known Homeric formulae[69] and perhaps is there merely for epic color. Yet some repetition is inevitable here. Having decided to make Jupiter swear by the river Styx on two different occasions, it would not have been appropriate to vary the oaths, because they, like all ritual, are formulaic. As a dramatic gesture closing a scene the repetition conveys the impression of power and authority. On the other hand, the swearing of the mightiest Homeric oath in situations such as these, involving relatively minor matters that do not really affect the course of fate (*fata viam invenient!*),[70] may in fact underline the helplessness of the gods (9.97: *cui tanta deo permissa potestas?*).

The repeated invocation to the Muses before the catalogues in 7.641 and 10.163:

Pandite nunc Helicona, deae, cantusque movete,

also seems dictated by the context. The Homeric models are of course the catalogue of ships (*Il.* 2.494-760) and the catalogue of Myrmidons (*Il.* 16.168-97). The first was preceded by an invocation (*Il.* 2.484), which structurally corresponds to that in *Aeneid* 7. The second has no invocation, but Homer had called on the Muses shortly before, when Hector was setting fire to the ships (*Il.* 16.112 = 2.484). Although Vergil had already transformed that invocation at an analogous point in 9.77-79, it seems that the Homeric repetition in Book 16 has led him to introduce his second catalogue with the same invocation as the first.[71] Here again we can observe the difference between Vergilian and Homeric practice. Homer uses the same formula two more times (*Il.* 11.218, 14.508); Vergil confines his repetition to the catalogues, thereby stressing the opposition of the two contingents and giving a structural dimension to an essentially decorative formula.

The catalogue of Italian warriors includes the *horrida gens* of Ufens:

7.748 armati terram exercent *semperque recentis*
convectare iuvat praedas et vivere rapto.

Numanus uses a similar line to taunt the Trojans and contrast their presumed effeminacy with the hardiness of the Italians:

9.612 canitiem galea premimus, *semperque recentis*
comportare iuvat praedas et vivere rapto.

[69] Zeus shakes Olympus with his nod in *Il.* 1.528-30, while in *Il.* 15.37-38 and *Od.* 5.185-86 gods swear by the river Styx. Vergil has combined two Homeric motifs into a single formula.

[70] Cf. Pötscher (1977: 54).

[71] Cf. Knauer (1964: 47 n1, 227 n1).

Although all the tribes in the catalogue are warlike, only the tribe of Ufens is said to live from the spoils of war and brigandage. This aspect Numanus emphasizes through the repetition, exalting brute force and making it the characteristic of all Italians. Numanus is no ordinary braggart, for he represents the rustic toughness that has deep roots in the Roman character and tradition, and it seems to have been much admired by Vergil himself, if we may judge from his praise in the *Georgics* of the farmer's simple life:

G 2.471 illic saltus ac lustra ferarum
et *patiens operum* exigu*oque adsueta iuventus*,
sacra deum sanctique patres; extrema per illos
Iustitia excedens terris vestigia fecit.

By having Numanus quote a line from that passage,

9.607 at *patiens operum* parv*oque adsueta iuventus*
aut rastris terram domat aut quatit oppida bellō,

Vergil suggests that there is an affinity between this Roman ideal and the Spartan simplicity of early Italy. What Numanus in fact does is challenge the Trojans to show themselves worthy of their descendants. He is defeated by Ascanius not because he lacks the toughness he boasts of, but because he fails to see that his ideal is flawed. He lacks those very qualities which in the Second *Georgic* raise the hardy farmer's life to a philosophic ideal—piety and justice. These qualities are in turn brought out in Ascanius, who young though he be remembers to pray for victory and vow a sacrifice.[72]

II. DESIGN

A. *Quotations*

The most obvious form of repetition that makes reference to an earlier passage involves instances where one character quotes another to affirm, reject, or allude to what had been said. Related to it is a variation where Vergil himself echoes an order, plan, or prediction so as to suggest its fulfilment.

1. *Answer*

This type is not very different from the repetitions that may be observed in amoebaean song or in parallel speeches of tragedy and comedy. It arises quite naturally when one character wishes to correct, deny, or ridicule what another had said.[73]

[72] Just as Cloanthus had done earlier during the boat race (cf. 9.627-28 = 5.236-37).

[73] Highet (1972: 78) notes that Vergil's speakers often quote opponents to refute them; see also his comments on Dido speaking to Aeneas (pp. 148-52), Juno to Venus (pp. 69-72), Turnus to Drances (pp. 60-61, 210-12).

Aeneas and Dido:

4.345 sed *nunc* Italiam magnam Gryneus *Apollo*,
Italiam *Lyciae* iussere capessere *sortes*;...
.356 *nunc et*iam *interpres divum Iove missus ab ipso*...
.361 *Italiam* non sponte *sequor*.
4.376 *nunc* augur *Apollo*,
nunc *Lyciae sortes*, *nunc et Iove missus ab ipso*
interpres divum fert horrida iussa per auras....
.381 i, *sequere Italiam* ventis.

Aeneas and Palinurus:

6.341 sic prior adloquitur: 'quis te, Palinure, DEORUM
eripuit nobis medioque sub *aequore mersit*?'
6.348 dux Anchisiade, nec me DEUS *aequore mersit.*

Turnus and Allecto:

7.440 sed te *victa situ veri*que *effeta senectus*,
o mater, curis nequiquam exercet, et *arma*
regum inter falsa vatem *formidine ludit.*
cura tibi divum effigies et templa tueri;
bella viri pacemque *ger*ent quis bella gerenda.
7.452 en ego *victa situ*, quam *veri effeta senectus*
arma inter regum falsa formidine ludit.
respice ad haec: adsum dirarum ab sede sororum,
bella manu letumque *ger*o.

Remulus and Ascanius:

9.599 *bis capti Phryges*, et morti praetendere muros?
9.635 *bis capti Phryges* haec Rutulis responsa remittunt.

Venus and Juno:

10.25 *Aeneas ignarus abest.* numquamne levari...
.51 est Amathus, *est* celsa m*ihi Paphus* atque *Cythera*
*Idali*a*eque* domus:
10.85 "*Aeneas ignarus abest:*" ignarus et absit.
*est Paphus Idali*um*que* t*ibi*, sunt alta *Cythera.*

Drances and Turnus:

11.362 *nulla salus bello*, pacem te poscimus omnes,
11.399 *nulla salus bello*? capiti cane talia, demens,...

2. *Affirmation*

Perhaps the best example of such repetition is found in Book 4, where Jupiter bids Mercury to remind Aeneas of his duty:

4.232 *si nulla* accendi*t tantarum gloria rerum*
nec super ipse sua molitur laude laborem,
*Ascani*one pater Romanas invidet arces?
*quid strui*t? *aut qua spe* inimica in gente moratur
nec prolem Ausoniam et Lavinia *respic*it arva?

Mercury in turn faithfully echoes his father's words to Aeneas:

4.271 *quid struis*? *aut qua spe* Libycis teris otia terris?
si te *nulla* move*t tantarum gloria rerum*
[nec super ipse tua moliris laude laborem,]
*Ascani*um surgentem et spes heredis Iuli
*respic*e, cui regnum Italiae Romanaque tellus
debetur.

There is variation (cf. also 226 ~ 270),[74] but after so short an interval the degree of repetition is very striking. Clearly the decision to give both speeches committed Vergil to some amount of repetition, for it would have been inappropriate for Mercury to change substantially the wording of Jupiter's command. In the Odyssean scene imitated here Hermes repeats verbatim Zeus' order to Calypso (cf. *Od.* 5.41-42 = 114-15). Yet normally Vergil tends to avoid repetition of commands by simply omitting one of the speeches. Thus when Juno sends Iris to make the Trojan women burn their ships (5.606-40) or to tell Turnus to attack the Trojan camp (9.12-13), her instructions are not given, but left to be inferred from Iris' speech and activity. Vergil's decision to forego such an expedient in this scene suggests he felt that the words of Jupiter would gain power and emphasis through repetition. He uses the same technique later when Aeneas echoes Mercury in his reply to Dido:

4.270 ipse haec ferre iubet *celeris mandata per auras*
4.357 (testor utrumque caput) *celeris mandata per auras*...

There are several other instances of affirmation, such as when Opis repeats to herself the instructions of Diana:

11.585 militia tali *conata lacessere Teucros*:
.591 hac, *quicumque* sacrum *violarit vulnere corpus*,

11.842 supplicium *Teucros conata lacessere* bello!
.848 nam *quicumque* tuum *violavit vulnere corpus*...

Not quite analogous, but clearly referring to the same scene are the laments of Aeneas and Evander over Pallas:

11.45 *non haec* Euandro DĒ te *promissa parenti*
discedens *dederam*,

[74] See Highet (1972: 123-24) on the significance of the changes introduced by Mercury.

11.152 *non haec*, o Palla, *DĔderas promissa parenti*.

Sometimes the same person repeats what he had said earlier. Thus Nisus first announces his plan to Euryalus:

9.188 cernis quae *Rutulos* habeat fiducia rerum:
lumina rara micant, *somno vinoque soluti*
procub*uere*, silent late *loc*a.

9.194 si tibi quae posco promittunt (nam mihi facti
fama sat est), tumulo videor reperire sub illo
posse viam ad muros *et moenia Pallantea*,

and then reiterates it before the council:

9.236 *Rutuli somno vinoque soluti*[75]
contic*uere*: *loc*um insidiis conspeximus ipsi,
qui patet in bivio portae quae proxima ponto.
interrupti ignes aterque ad sidera fumus
erigitur. si fortuna permittitis uti
quaesitum Aenean *et moenia Pallantea*.

More distantly related to the above examples are several repetitions occurring during Aeneas' visit to the underworld. When he asks the Sibyl to show him the way (6.109), he reminds her of the power vested in her through Hecate:

6.117 alma, precor, miserere (potes namque omnia, nec te
nequiquam *lucis Hecate praefecit Avernis*).

Her reply (*cum sic orsa loqui vates*, 125), though it makes no reference to Hecate, leaves little doubt that she does possess the power attributed to her. Later, when they are about to turn towards Elysium, Aeneas inquires about the noise emanating from Tartarus (560f.), and the Sibyl explains (her answer is introduced by the same speaking formula as before: *tum vates sic orsa loqui*, 562 = 125) what Hecate had once shown her when she made her guardian of Avernus' groves:

6.564 sed me cum *lucis Hecate praefecit Avernis*,
ipsa deum poenas docuit perque omnia duxit.

The repetition affirms Aeneas' earlier belief in the Sibyl's power and lends her revelation greater legitimacy and authority.

The repetition of prophecies illustrates another aspect of affirmation, although such repetition is not as frequent as one might expect in an epic where prophecy plays such an important role. In gradually revealing the

[75] Although derived from Ennius (*Ann.* 292-93: *nunc hostes vino domiti somnoque sepulti/ consiluere*; cf. also Lucr. 1.133, 5.974), after so short a space the repetition would hardly be unconscious.

goal of Aeneas' voyage Vergil prefers to rely on key words such as *Ausonia*, *Hesperia*, *Italia*, and *Thybris*. Some shorter phrases are also repeated, but generally variation seems to be the rule, so that the few exceptions, which constitute the longest repetitions in the whole *Aeneid*, stand out all the more clearly. Here, as in the case of repeated commands, there are several Homeric examples,[76] although Vergil's use of such repetition is different from Homer's.

When a plague ravages the new Trojan settlement on Crete, the Penates appear to Aeneas in a dream:

3.163 *est locus, Hesperiam Grai cognomine dicunt,*
terra antiqua, potens armis atque ubere glaebae;
Oenotri coluere viri; nunc fama minores
Italiam dixisse ducis de nomine gentem.
hae nobis propriae sedes, *hinc Dardanus ortus*
Iasiusque pater, genus a quo principe nostrum.

This prophecy marks the actual beginning of the Trojan voyage to Italy, and later Ilioneus in his speech before Latinus echoes the Penates about Dardanus' Italian descent:

7.239 sed nos fata deum vestras exquirere terras
imperiis egere suis. *hinc Dardanus ortus,*
huc repetit iussisque ingentibus urget Apollo
Tyrrhenum ad Thybrim et fontis vada sacra Numici.

But the most striking parallel occurs in Book 1, where in describing Italy to Dido Ilioneus quotes (as we discover later) the prophecy of the Penates:

1.530 *est locus, Hesperiam Grai cognomine dicunt,*
terra antiqua, potens armis atque ubere glaebae;
Oenotri coluere viri; nunc fama minores
Italiam dixisse ducis de nomine gentem.
hic cursus fuit.

A number of scholars have tried to show that one or the other passage was composed first, or that one of them was a *tibicen* that eventually would have been altered or deleted.[77] Assuming that extensive repetition would not have been tolerated in the final version, they have generally failed to consider the possible effectiveness of the lines in question.

[76] Teiresias (*Od.* 11.114-15) repeats two lines from the curse of Polyphemus (*Od.* 9.534-35), while his warning about the cattle of the Sun (*Od.* 11.110-114) is in turn repeated by Circe (*Od.* 12.137-41).

[77] Büchner (1955: 1428) maintains that the passage was originally written for Book 3, as does Sparrow (1931: 93). Heinze (1915: 89 n2) tries to support his theory that Book 3 was composed late by arguing for the priority of the Book 1 passage. R. D. Williams (on 3.163-66) and Austin (on 1.530-33) are undecided about priority, but both follow Sparrow in believing that Vergil would have deleted or altered one of the passages.

When Ilioneus utters these words we are not aware that he is quoting the Penates, but there is in the first line an unmistakable echo from the *Annales* of Ennius:

Ann. 23 *est locus Hesperiam* quam mortales perhibebant,

which gives the passage the solemn, archaic tone of an oracular response. Because in the Dido episode Aeneas loses sight of his mission, it is particularly important to stress at the very beginning the final destination of the Trojans. This purpose is best served by an exact statement of the very prophecy that had first revealed it, and by Ilioneus rather than Aeneas as the spokesman. In his mouth the repeated passage becomes a solemn reminder of Aeneas' duty, and when later it recurs as the prophecy of the Penates, we not only recognize the source of Ilioneus' words, but the prophecy itself becomes more impressive because of the repetition.

The appearance of the Penates sets Aeneas on the right path, but it remains for Helenus to show him where it all will end. He describes a portent (*signa tibi dicam*, 3.388) by which Aeneas would be able to recognize that he had reached his goal:

3.389 cum tibi sollicito secreti ad fluminis undam
litoreis ingens inventa sub ilicibus sus
triginta capitum fetus enixa iacebit,
alba solo recubans, albi circum ubera nati,
is *locus urbis erit, requies ea certa laborum.*

The last four lines are repeated by Tiber in 8.43-46, with the slight variation of *is* to *hic* in the last line. While some editors go as far as rejecting 8.42-49 as an interpolation, a large majority think that the whole passage is unfinished and line 46 spurious.[78] It is too involved a controversy to try to resolve here, but I do believe that although the passage seems unfinished, lines 43-45 must be genuine and the repetition intentional.

[78] Heyne, Peerlkamp, Ribbeck suggest that the whole passage (8.42-49) may have been interpolated and propose that 8.41 be joined with the latter part of 8.49 (*nunc qua ratione quod instat*) to form a hexameter. Conington (on 8.46) rightly objects that such an interpolation is unlikely. Still, many find the passage unfinished, e.g. Hirtzel, Sparrow (1931: 102-103), Steiner (1952: 71-72). Heinze (1915: 92-95), followed by Steiner (p. 71), argues that Vergil had probably planned to transfer the sow omen to the landing of the Trojans at the Tiber in Book 7. For a critique of Heinze's theory that Book 3 is later than Books 7 and 8 see Büchner (1955: 1365). A useful discussion of the sow omen (with good bibliography) may be found in Grassman-Fischer (1966: 54-63) and Eden (1975: 26-30).

Line 8.46 is generally regarded as spurious, because it is lacking in all the major MSS except *R*, is not mentioned by Ti. Donatus, and apparently was not in the text of Servius, who interprets *ex quo* (8.47) as *qua ratiocinatione.* See Eden for further objections. However, the change from *is* to *hic* might speak for the line's authenticity. Buchheit (1965) has argued persuasively that Tibullus was familiar with the *Aeneid* and that in 2.5.56, *hic magnae iam locus urbis erit*, he is quoting Tiber's words in 8.46.

The tables omen in Book 7 had indicated that the time had come (*advenisse diem*, 7.145) when the Trojans might finally hope for a new home (*sperare domos*, 7.126), but the intervention of Allecto has cast doubt on the future of the Trojan settlement. An additional sign of confirmation is urgently needed. Tiber reaffirms what the tables omen had already revealed—Latium is the new home (8.38), and with *hic tibi certa domus* (8.39) he echoes Aeneas' joyous exclamation on recognizing that omen (*hic domus, haec patria est*, 7.122). But all this still provides little consolation in the present dilemma, for how can Aeneas possibly believe that the war poses no serious threat to the future (*neu belli terrere minis*, 8.40)? To dispel this doubt Tiber proceeds to describe the sow omen, which will not only gain him credence, but show Aeneas that the future is secure.

In repeating the words of Helenus, Tiber places himself within the mainstream of the prophecies that have guided the Trojans to Rome, and in so doing he establishes the trustworthiness of the additional prophecy he gives Aeneas. Any change in the description of the omen would have vitiated this effect by emphasizing an apparent incongruity between the versions of Helenus and Tiber. This would not only have destroyed the impression that the prophecies are complementary and consistent with one another, but even called into question their very reliability. Exact repetition, on the other hand, effectively corroborates what Hellenus had said. But Tiber is not just retrospective, recalling past prophecy, for he also heralds its fulfilment and reveals its significance. Helenus was only able to predict the founding of one city, which though unnamed must have been recognized by any Roman reader as Lavinium; Tiber goes on to explain that just as the sow will have a litter of thirty piglets, so thirty years hence Ascanius will found another city—Alba Longa.

3. *Fulfilment*

The repetitions considered here differ from the preceding examples in that one line usually expresses an order, plan, or prediction, while the other suggests its fulfilment. Often the first is in direct speech, as when Helenus tells Aeneas that the Sibyl will give him valuable advice:

3.459 *et quo quemque modo fugiasque ferasque laborem*
expediet.

A repetition of these words in the narrative at the end of Book 6 implies that Helenus was right:

6.892 *et quo quemque modo fugiatque feratque laborem.*[79]

[79] Austin (on 6.892) believes one or the other passage would have been revised.

The same pattern may be observed in Book 4 compressed into a brief sequence of scenes. Juno is first shown explaining her plan to Venus:

4.120 his ego nigrantem *commixta grandine nimbum*,...
.123 diffugient *comites* et nocte tegentur opaca:
speluncam Dido dux et Troianus eandem
devenient.

In the next scene the account of the sudden storm echoes Juno's words as if to show that her plan is being realized:

4.161 insequitur *commixta grandine nimbus*,
et Tyrii *comites* passim et Troiana iuventus...
.165 *speluncam Dido dux et Troianus eandem*
deveniunt.

At the beginning of Book 9 Turnus takes the metamorphosis of the ships as a confirmation of the Trojans' hopeless plight:

9.131 *nec spes ulla fugae*: rerum pars altera adempta est,

and he starts to prepare the siege:

9.159 *interea* vigilum excubiis obsidere *portas*
cura datur Messapo *et moenia cingere flammis*.

In Book 10 the situation does indeed appear hopeless, for the Trojans are completely cut off:

10.118 *interea* Rutuli *portis* circum omnibus instant
sternere caede viros *et moenia cingere flammis*.
at legio Aeneadum vallis obsessa tenetur
nec spes ulla fugae.

In another scene Turnus gives orders:

11.463 'tu, Voluse, armari Volscorum edice maniplis,
duc' ait 'et Rutulos. equitem *Messapus* in armis,
et cum fratre Coras latis diffundite campis.'

Somewhat later we see Messapus and Coras at the head of the Latin army, presumably carrying out Turnus' instructions:

11.603 nec non *Messapus* contra celeresque Latini
et cum fratre Coras et virginis ala Camillae
adversi campo apparent.

Akin to the above examples is one particular set of repetitions in the scene between Aeneas and Anchises in Book 6. Aeneas finds his father surveying the souls of his descendants:

6.679 at pater Anchises penitus convalle virenti
inclusas animas super*umque* ad lu*men ituras*

> LUSTRabat studio recolens, omnemque suorum
> forte recensebat numerum, carosque *nepotes*
> *fata*que fortunasque virum moresque manusque.

He is interrupted by the arrival of Aeneas, but when the latter inquires about the souls thronging around the river Lethe, he returns to his initial activity:

> 6.756 'nunc age, Dardaniam prolem quae deinde sequatur
> gloria, qui maneant Itala de gente *nepotes*,
> *inLUSTRis animas* nostr*umque* in no*men ituras*,
> expediam dictis, et te tua *fata* docebo.

At the very beginning of the scene Anchises is cast in the role of the ancestor anticipating the future glories of his race. The resumption of this role is emphasized by verbal echoes and an imitative line (6.758) which is not really essential in its context and whose main function apparently is to recall the initial preoccupation of Anchises (6.680-81). What we have here is an inversion of the usual plan-and-fulfilment sequence. Anchises is first presented as doing something, and then he himself says he is doing it. But in as far as it also involves the resumption of an earlier activity, this example is very close to ring composition, which brings us to the next category.

B. *Ring Composition*

Van Otterlo distinguishes two basic types: inclusory or framing ring composition, which unifies a passage by linking the end with the beginning, and anaphorical or resumptive ring composition, which mainly serves to pick up the narrative after a digression (1944: 137).[80] Both are elements of the archaic style and therefore common in Homer.[81] The tale about the scar of Odysseus provides a good example of this technique. The transition to the hunt with Autolycus is effected the moment Eurycleia recognizes the scar (*Od.* 19.390-94), while the end of the digression is emphasized through echoes and repetitions from the beginning (*Od.* 19.464-68), and the narrative, suspended at a climactic point, now resumes as Eurycleia drops the foot of Odysseus into the basin. Extensive verbal repetition is not always necessary. Sometimes only the key words are reiterated, as in the speech of Phoenix (*Il.* 9.447-48 ~ 478) or in Nestor's account of his battle against the Epeians (*Il.* 11.664f. ~ 762f., 670 ~ 762). Ring composition may be at work on a small scale, rounding

[80] "Wir haben ... zwischen der einrahmenden oder inklusorischen und der wiederaufnehmenden oder anaphorischen Funktion der Ringkomposition zu unterscheiden." For ring composition in Homer see also Van Otterlo (1948).

[81] Its use in Homer had already been observed in antiquity, cf. schol. on *Il.* 11.671.

off paragraphs (e.g. *Il.* 9.485f. ~ 494f.), or it may enclose much larger structures.

Odysseus' reply to Arete's persistent questioning contains two repetitions that have a double purpose, for they both unify a paragraph and also take part in a larger pattern of ring composition extending over several books. Odysseus begins with a description of Ogygia and Calypso (*Od.* 7.244-46), the relevance of which becomes clear only after he tells how he was cast ashore there by the storm, at which point he echoes the description (*Od.* 7.253-56). Ogygia and Calypso are thus introduced twice: first as objective geographical realities, and then as part of Odysseus' subjective experience. These repetitions, which frame the shipwreck and the loss of his companions, also emphasize the structural importance of Calypso in the wanderings of Odysseus. Although the narrative of his adventures properly begins only in Book 9, at the end of his tale he repeats what he had said to Arete about Calypso (*Od.* 12.447-50 = 7.253-56), which suggests an attempt at ring composition on a grander scale. The story of Odysseus has thus come full circle. To Arete he had already related his voyage from Ogygia to Scheria. When he continues his account in Book 9, he begins with Troy and ends with Ogygia. To complete the circle, the gap between Scheria and Troy is in Book 8 bridged by several references to the Trojan War,[82] which prepare the audience for the revelation of Odysseus' heroic identity at the beginning of his tale.

The beginning and end of Aeneas' tale also provides an example of ring composition:

> 2.1 *conticu*ere *omnes intenti*que ora tenebant;
> inde toro *pater Aeneas sic* orsus ab alto:
>
> 3.716 *sic pater Aeneas intentis omni*bus unus
> fata renarrabat divum cursusque docebat.
> *conticu*it tandem factoque hic fine quievit.

But the effect is much more artfully contrived than in Homer, for the echoes are arranged in chiastic order contrasting the expectant silence of the audience with the silence of Aeneas at the end. In Homer the scene continues with a comment by Alcinoos (*Od.* 13.4-15); in Vergil no one breaks the spell. Ring composition does not resume the narrative but rather frames the tale of Aeneas and sets it apart from the rest. It is the

[82] Demodocus sings about the quarrel between Odysseus and Achilles (*Od.* 8.73-82); Odysseus mentions how at Troy only Philoctetes surpassed him in archery (*Od.* 8.219-20); finally, Demodocus sings about the Wooden Horse and the Fall of Troy (*Od.* 8.487-520). For a detailed discussion of how Vergil transformed these Odyssean scenes see Knauer (1964: 165-73, esp. 172).

most common application of this device in Vergil. The frame may involve paragraphs or short scenes, or it may span several books, in which case the repetition generally stresses the similarity or contrast of the scenes that make up such a larger framework. Thus, for example, the balance between the Jupiter-Venus scene in Book 1 and the Jupiter-Juno scene in Book 12 is brought out by the repetition of the formula that in each case introduces Jupiter's reply:

1.254 *olli subridens hominum* sator at*que* deorum
12.829 *olli subridens hominum* rerum*que* repertor.[83]

Another example is the repetition of *solvuntur frigore membra* (1.92 = 12.951), which balances the despair of Aeneas in the storm with his final victory over Turnus (see above, p. 78). Less obvious is the correspondence between the funerals of Polydorus and Pallas—the first and last acts of ritual mourning performed by Aeneas, which is further emphasized through a repeated line describing the grief of the Trojan women:

3.65 *et* circ*um Iliades crinem de more solutae*;
11.35 *et* maest*um Iliades crinem de more solutae.*

The burial of Polydorus, occurring at the start of Aeneas' wanderings, functions as a *leitmotif* and suggests the pain and suffering still to come. The burial of Pallas looks back to Polydorus, compounding the feeling of loss and recalling at what cost the promised land had been gained.[84]

---

[83] There are some supportive echoes: Jupiter's *quae iam finis erit* (12.793) recalls Venus' *quem das finem* (1.241); in both cases Jupiter begins with a reference to Aeneas' future deification:

1.259 ...sublimemque feres *ad sidera caeLI*
magnanimum *Aenean*;

12.794 indigetem *Aenean* scis ipsa et scire fateris
deberi *caelo* fatisque *ad sidera* tol*LI*.

See also Knauer (1964: 323-27), Halter (1963: 86-87). W. R. Johnson (1976: 124-27 and n105) finds the Jupiter-Juno scene sinister and disturbing in comparison to the Jupiter-Venus scene.

[84] There are some thematic similarities and contrasts between the stories of Polydorus and Pallas which may have suggested the structural parallel to Vergil. In both cases a king's son is entrusted to an ally and meets his death. Polydorus is murdered because of the Thracian king's greed, whereas Pallas dies fighting for Aeneas' cause, but both deaths are seen as violations of trust and *pietas*. The first deliberate (*fas omne abrumpit*, 3.55), the other unintentional, though Aeneas still speaks of it in terms of *promissa* (11.45) and *fides* (11.55) betrayed. Both Polydorus and Pallas are symbols of hope frustrated, yet the former represents a pathetic attempt to escape Troy's fated defeat (*cum iam diffideret armis*, 3.51), while the latter does not live to see the final Trojan victory (11.43-44).

Normally, however, frames enclose smaller units of composition,[85] as for example the battle scenes in Book 2. When Aeneas rushes forth into the fray, he is joined by a number of other Trojans:

2.339 addunt se socios *Rhipeus et* max*imus* armis
Epytus, oblati per lunam, *Hypanisque Dymasque*
et lateri adglomerant nostro, iuveni*sque Coroebus*
Mygdonides.

With this band Aeneas meets some initial successes, surprises the Greeks under Androgeos, and at the suggestion of Coroebus—

2.386 atque hic successu exsultans anim*isque Coroebus*,

they put on the arms of their defeated enemy. The disguise works until they come under attack by both their own countrymen and the Greeks, who by now have recognized them by their speech as Trojans:

2.424 ilicet obruimur numero, primu*sque Coroebus*
Penelei dextra divae armipotentis ad aram
procumbit; cadit *et Rhipeus*, iustiss*imus* unus
qui fuit in Teucris et servantissimus aequi
(dis aliter visum); pereunt *Hypanisque Dymasque*
confixi a sociis.

The repetitions, though very brief, set off the account of Aeneas' short-lived success from the next scene which describes the battle for Priam's palace.

A similar frame occurs in Book 12, where Tolumnius trusting in Juturna's omen breaks the treaty:

12.257 tum vero augurium Rutuli clamore salutant
expediuntque manus, *primus*que *Tolumnius augur*...

12.266 dixit, et *adversos telum* con*torsi*t *in hostis*
procurrens.

This act, and the subsequent wounding of Aeneas (12.319), gives the Rutulians a temporary advantage, but as Aeneas is miraculously healed and returns to battle (12.441ff.), the tide quickly turns to favor the Trojans. Many are killed in the slaughter that follows, including Tolumnius himself:

12.460 cadit ipse *Tolumnius augur*,
primus in adversos telum qui *tors*erat *hostis*.

The treaty-breaker thus meets his proper punishment.

---

[85] Halter (1963) finds that Vergil structures important episodes symmetrically around a central panel with careful thematic, rhythmical, and syntactical responsion.

The last two examples involved repetitions that marked the first appearance and death of particular heroes, and tended to coincide with the beginning and the end of a scene. This same pattern may also be observed in the battle of Book 11, where the initial advance of the Latins,

11.607 *adventusque* vir*um fremitusque* ar*descit equorum*,

is echoed at the end of the battle, when Turnus recognizes Aeneas and hears the approach of the army:

11.910 et saevum Aenean agnovit Turnus in armis
*adventum*q*ue* pe*dum flatusque* au*divit equorum.*

Within this larger frame there is a smaller one enclosing the death of Camilla, where Apollo's reaction to the prayer of Arruns,

11.796 sterneret ut subita t*urbatam morte Camillam*
adnuit oranti,

balances that of Opis to Camilla's death:

11.839 prospexit tristi m*ulcatam morte Camillam*,
ingemuitque deditque has imo pectore voces.

The repetitions flanking the Achaemenides-Cyclops episode fall into the same category, although one of them is not strictly part of that episode. Encouraged by the Trojans' magnanimity and the pledge of Anchises, Achaemenides reveals his name and origin:

3.613 sum patria ex Ithaca, *comes infelicis Ulixi*,
nomine *Achaemenides*,

and warns them of the Cyclops. When the latter appears, the Trojans just barely manage to escape as a timely north wind blows them out of danger:

3.687 ecce autem Boreas angusta ab sede Pelori
missus adest: vivo praetervehor ostia saxo
Pantagiae Megarosque sinus Thapsumque iacentem.
talia monstrabat relegens errata retrorsus
litora *Achaemenides*, *comes infelicis Ulixi.*

The last two lines are hardly necessary to explain Aeneas' knowledge of the various placenames (cf. Servius on 3.689: *quia occurrebat*: *unde haec loca nosti*?), for such knowledge is generally assumed without question. The reference to Achaemenides rather seems to be a reminder that his warning had saved the Trojans. Repetition marks his change from suppliant to guide, rounding out the episode and separating it from the last part of the book.

Similar patterns of repetition also occur on a smaller scale. Phrase and word repetition often lends structural unity to paragraphs and short

episodes by creating a frame, emphasizing a motif, or bringing out the symmetry of the scene. Thus, for example, word repetition accompanies parallel action in the description of Dido's banquet. First Aeneas and the Trojans enter:

1.699 iam pater Aeneas et iam Troiana iuventus
*conven*iunt, stratoque super *discumb*itur ostro,

and then follow the Carthaginians:

1.707 nec non et Tyrii per limina laeta frequentes
*convene*re; toris iussi *discumbere* pictis...

Such symmetry may also be observed in the passage where Tolumnius breaks the truce (12.256-86). In response to the eagle omen he urges the Rutulians to seize arms:

12.260 accipio agnoscoque deos; me, me duc*e ferrum*
*corripi*te, o miseri,

and then himself runs forward to hurl his spear against the enemy:

12.266 dixit, et adversos telum contorsit in hostis
*procurr*ens.

The description of the ensuing fray echoes the action of Tolumnius as if to emphasize that he is the cause of the renewed fighting:

12.277 at fratres, animosa phalanx accensaque luctu,
pars gladios stringunt manibus, pars missil*e ferrum*
*corripi*unt caecique ruunt. quos agmina contra
*procurr*unt Laurentum.

But while these echoes stress the scene's parallel actions, they also link Tolumnius' intent with its realization, and so are akin to the repetitions discussed above under 'fulfilment'.

Another example of reaction balancing action is contained in the Laocoon scene. The Trojans flee at the sight of the snakes attacking Laocoon:

2.212 diffugimus visu exsangues. illi agmine certo
Laocoonta petunt.

There follows the description of how the snakes kill him and his sons, and then take refuge at the statue of Pallas, at which point the focus returns to the Trojans:

2.228 tum vero tremefacta novus per pectora cunctis
insinuat pavor, et scelus expendisse merentem
Laocoonta ferunt.

The repetition effectively rounds out the whole scene and emphasizes the connection between the attack of Laocoon and its impact on the Trojan people, who in their fear are ready to find him guilty of sacrilege.[86]

At the end of his prophecy Tiber echoes what he had said in the beginning:

8.39 *hic* t*ibi* *certa* *domus*, *certi* (ne absiste) penates.
8.65 *hic* m*ihi* magn*a* *domus*, *celsis* caput urbibus exit.

Beyond its obvious structural function this frame also stresses the tutelary role of Tiber by suggesting an identification between his *domus* and the one promised Aeneas long ago. Such framing is not uncommon in other speeches, such as Venus' interpretation of the swan omen, where she begins and ends by urging Aeneas to go directly to Carthage:

1.389 *perge modo* *atque* hinc *te* reginae ad limina perfer.
1.401 *perge modo* et, *qua* *te* ducit via, derige gressum.

A more subtle example of framing occurs in Dido's speech to Anna about her plan to regain Aeneas' love or rid herself of the passion. She begins by mentioning the Massylian priestess:

4.483 hinc mihi Massylae gentis *monstrata sacerdos*,

and then, after describing her magic powers and instructing Anna to erect a pyre, she ends with a second reference to the priestess:

4.497 abolere nefandi
cuncta viri monimenta iuvat *monstrat*que *sacerdos*.

This frame diverts attention to the alleged source of Dido's instructions and in this way helps to conceal the real purpose of her plan.[87]

C. *Thematic Association*

Ring composition, being a structural device, is by nature static, for in its pure form it initiates no movement or change. Most examples, however, are not purely structural in function, for even when the repetitions enclose relatively short compositional units, they often emphasize similarities and contrasts. When these concerns begin to predominate, ring composition gradually becomes what can be called 'thematic association'. This is particularly true of repetitions occurring farther apart, for

[86] Halter (1963: 34) comments on the concentric structure of the episode.

[87] Newton (1953: 24-218) gives many more examples of word repetition used effectively to frame scenes, round off paragraphs, or underline parallels and contrasts. Cf. also Bömer (1944: 333-35), G. Williams (1968: 233-49).

although they may still articulate the larger structure of the poem, they generally do so to bring out the parallels or contrasts between the respective scenes. This allows for thematic development and hence for the possibility of altering the reader's perception of a scene or character.

1. *Analogy*

In Book 3 Helenus supplies Aeneas with gifts, horses, and rowers:

3.471 *remigi*um supple*t*, *socios simul instruit armis*.

A similar line recurs in Book 8, when after the Tiber vision Aeneas prepares to go to Pallanteum:

8.80 *remigio*que apta*t*, *socios simul instruit armis*.

Though the lines are formulaic in appearance and may have been influenced by similar Homeric verses (e.g. *Od.* 2.422-23 = 15.287-88), they do occur at analogous junctures of the poem: the first after the prophecy of Helenus, who describes the sow omen, urges Aeneas to appease Juno with prayer and sacrifice, and directs him to visit the Cumaean Sibyl for further advice and assistance; the other in the very scene in which Tiber repeats the description of the sow omen (3.390-93 = 8.43-46), the directive to appease Juno (3.438-39 = 8.60-61), and then instructs him to go to Evander for aid in the war against the Latins. The parallels continue, for the role of the Sibyl, who guides Aeneas through the underworld, corresponds to that of Evander, who guides him through Rome past and present. And both books end with a glimpse of Rome's future, Anchises pointing out to Aeneas the glories of his descendants and Venus presenting him with the shield. The parallel function of Books 6 and 8 is well known and needs no demonstration.[88] But the repetition of Helenus' words through Tiber indicates that Vergil also wished to link these two prophecies (see above, pp. 113-14). In view of such a high degree of structural correlation it does not seem surprising that Vergil should have equated the preparations to leave Buthrotum with the preparations to leave the Trojan camp for Pallanteum, and emphasized this larger structural parallel through repetition.

A similar kind of association may also be observed between the Sinon and Achaemenides episodes. In both cases the Trojans are faced with a

[88] The crossing of the Styx seems to correspond roughly to the voyage on the Tiber, and in both cases there is a short repetition:

6.384 *ergo iter inceptum* perag*unt* fluvioqu*e* propinquant.
8.90 *ergo iter inceptum* celer*ant* rumor*e* secundo.

Greek suppliant, and each time they react compassionately and urge him to reveal his name and origin:

2.74 *hortamur fari quo sanguine cretus,*
3.608 qui sit *fari, quo sanguine cretus,*
hortamur, quae deinde agitet fortuna fateri.

It is the normal question one asked of strangers in heroic epic, but its formulaic origin is really not the issue here. The essential similarity between the two Vergilian scenes lies in the reaction of the Trojans to suppliants, and it is this aspect that the repetition emphasizes. Their willingness to help Achaemenides even after Sinon's horrible deception proves their deep-seated humanity.[89]

Sometimes repetition points out the symbolic value of certain events, such as the boat-race at the funeral games for Anchises, which like the temple pictures at Carthage summarizes the past and anticipates the future. It is a microcosm of Aeneas' journey, and the island around which the race is run corresponds to Sicily, which must be rounded before Aeneas can turn his course to Italy. Both islands represent particularly hazardous points and as such are joined by verbal echoes:

3.429 praestat Trinacrii *metas* lustrare Pachyni
cessantem, *longos et circumflectere cursus,*

5.129 hic viridem Aeneas frondenti ex ilice *metam*
constituit signum nautis pater, unde reverti
scirent *et longos* ubi *circumflectere cursus.*[90]

But the symbolism of the boat-race extends beyond the parallel with the voyage to later trials and conflicts. Norden and Kraggerud have already observed that the race is envisioned in terms of a sea battle,[91] and that is probably why a line from it recurs in the description of the battle of Actium:

5.140 ferit aethera clamor
nauticus, ad*ductis spumant* freta versa lacertis.
infindunt pariter sulcos, *totum*que dehiscit
convulsum remis rostrisque tridentibus aequor.

8.689 una omnes ruere ac *totum spumare* re*ductis*
convulsum remis rostrisque tridentibus aequor.

The virtues exhibited in the race have a validity that transcends the immediate context, while the race itself provides the pattern for the

[89] See Heinze (1915: 113), Knight (1944: 293-94).
[90] See Kraggerud (1968: 124-26, 160-66).
[91] Kraggerud (1968: 173 n170); Norden (1915: 163ff.) suspects that Vergil is imitating an Ennian description of a sea battle.

continuing conflict of historical forces, which in Actium attains an almost apocalyptic dimension.[92]

In Book 11 the grief of the Trojans and allies over their fallen comrades is described as follows:

11.191 sparg*itur* et tellus lacrimis, sparguntur et arma,
it caelo *clamorque virum clangorque tubarum.*

The second line recalls the terrifying scene which confronted Aeneas when he woke up to find Troy sinking into ashes:

2.310 iam Deiphobi dedit ampla ruinam
Volcano superante domus, iam proximus ardet
Ucalegon; Sigea igni freta late relucent.
exor*itur clamorque virum clangorque tubarum.*[93]

Conington (on 2.313) suggests that Vergil may have been thinking of the simile in *Iliad* 18.219-20, where the shout of Achilles is likened to the blare of a trumpet sounded by the murderous attackers of a city. Contextual similarity makes such a recollection probable in Book 2, but it does not explain the repetition in Book 11. Servius (on 11.192) says that in the old days people were buried to the sound of the *tuba.*[94] But even though we may explain the *clangor tubarum* in this way and regard the *clamor virum* as a reference to the *ululatus* (cf. 11.190), the line still seems more appropriate in Book 2. *Clamor virum* and *clangor tubarum* tend to evoke a martial rather than a funereal setting, and perhaps this was part of Vergil's intention. The apparent incongruity makes the line stand out from its context so as to recall the destruction of Troy, linking this most traumatic and bitter memory of the Trojans with their present grief over their fallen comrades and over the tragic death of Pallas.

Whereas reminiscences of Troy tend to occur at moments of pain and grief, Italy generally has more positive associations. Thus when the Trojan envoys enter the palace of Latinus, they behold, among other things, statues of ancient kings and heroes who had bravely fought for their country:

7.181 aliique ab origine reges,
Martiaque *ob patriam pugnando vulnera passi.*

[92] There is also an echo between the boat race and the catalogue of Aeneas' allies (cf. 5.156-58 ~ 10.194-97). It might be unconscious or perhaps occasioned by the fact that *Centaurus* is the name of both Sergestus' and Cupavo's ships.
[93] Cf. a less exact parallel in the description of the storm:

1.87 insequ*itur clamorque virum* strid*orque* rudent*um.*

Note that all three lines occur in passages describing major catastrophes.
[94] *Ante enim mortui ad tubam deducebantur,* cf. also Pers. 3.103.

The last line recalls the passage where upon entering the Groves of the Blessed Aeneas sees the Trojan ancestors (6.648-50 ~ 7.177-81), and then those whose heroism had gained them a lasting place in memory:

6.660 hic manus *ob patriam pugnando vulnera passi.*

The parallels between the two scenes go further. Both describe the progress toward a central figure—Anchises or Latinus, both give lists of ancestors, and in both the youths are engaged in exercises (6.642-43 ~ 7.162-65). The martial nature of the latter contests not only stresses the Italians' prowess, but foreshadows their role in the upcoming war. These may seem commonplace motifs, but they do not occur elsewhere, such as the arrival at Carthage or Pallanteum, or in the Homeric and Apollonian models: the arrival of Odysseus in Scheria (*Od.* 7) and of Jason at Colchis (*Arg.* 3). We have then two scenes of striking thematic and structural similarity. Perhaps an association between Elysium and primitive Italy is not so farfetched if we consider the claim that the Golden Age under Saturn lasted the longest in Italy (cf. 8.319-27) and was to be restored under Augustus (cf. 6.792-94). The repetition strengthens this association and suggests that the kind of heroism through which men can enter the *sedes beatae* is already incarnate in Latinus' Italy.

2. *Contrast*

Repetition may often also accentuate reversals of situation or fortune. On landing at Carthage Aeneas mourns for the companions he believes lost in the storm:

1.220 praecipue pius Aeneas nunc acris Oronti,
nunc Amyci casum gemit et crudelia secum
fata Lyci *fortemque Gyan fortemque Cloanthum.*

The last line is poignantly recalled when he is reunited with them:

1.610 sic fatus amicum
Ilionea petit dextra laevaque Serestum,
post alios, *fortemque Gyan fortemque Cloanthum,*

emphasizing Aeneas' joy by contrasting it with the grief and despair of the earlier scene.[95]

A similar contrast exists between the simple meal at the seashore and the opulent banquet in Dido's palace. Both scenes contain the same expression:

[95] Cf. Conway on 1.612.

1.216 *postquam* exempta fam*es epulis mensaeque remotae*,[96]
amissos longo socios sermone requirunt.

1.723 *postquam* prima qui*es epulis mensaeque remotae*,[97]
crateras magnos statuunt et vina coronant.

The variation, probably dictated by the context (cf. Servius *ad loc.*), does not impair the repeated line's effectiveness in linking the two scenes to emphasize the contrast between simplicity and wealth, and between grief for a presumed loss and joy over the unexpected recovery.

In Book 2 repetition associates Laocoon with Androgeos. Laocoon rushes from the citadel to prevent the Trojans from taking the Wooden Horse into the city:

2.40 *primus* ibi ante omnis *magna comitante caterva*[98]
Laocoon ardens summa decurrit ab arce.

Androgeos appears with an equally large entourage:

2.370 *primus* se Danaum *magna comitante caterva*
Androgeos offert nobis.

The point of the comparison seems to be that Laocoon and Androgeos constitute the first Trojan and the first Greek victims in the final struggle for Troy. Laocoon is destroyed by the snakes (*angues*, 204) from Tenedos, where the Greek army lies waiting for the signal from Sinon (cf. 2.24). When Androgeos finds himself in the midst of Aeneas' band, he recoils like a man who has just stepped on a snake (*anguem*, 379). The situation is suddenly reversed and the snake imagery, hitherto associated with the Greeks, is now transferred to the Trojans, who under the cover of darkness are temporarily able to enmesh their foes in their own treachery.

Repetition emphasizes a similar reversal in Book 12. With Aeneas wounded, Turnus can range unopposed over the battlefield:

12.368 *sic Turno, quacumque viam* secat, agmina cedunt
conversaeque ruunt acies.

But it is only a temporary success. In the end, when he faces a revived Aeneas, his sword breaks and the huge stone he hurls falls short:

12.913 *sic Turno, quacumque viam* virtute petivit,
successum dea dira negat.

[96] The first part of the line recurs in 8.184: *postquam exempta fames et* amor compressus edendi. Both are, of course, based on a common Homeric formula (cf. *Od.* 3.67, etc.).
[97] Cf. *Il.* 1.469-70 and *A* 7.147, which virtually repeats *A* 1.724. A more distant parallel occurs in *G* 2.528.
[98] Cf. also 5.76, 1.497, 4.136.

More subtle verbal echoes articulate the structural parallelism of adjacent scenes in Book 3, where the landing at Delos (3.78 *huc feror*) and the prophecy of Apollo (3.93 *et vox fertur ad auris*) balance the landing at Thrace (3.16 *feror huc*) and the warning of Polydorus (3.40 *et vox* reddita *fertur ad auris*), contrasting the despair of having to flee a city just founded with the hope for a new land and a permanent home (3.97 *hic domus*).[99]

Repetition may also bring out contrasts between more widely separated scenes. At the height of the storm Aeneas wishes he had died at Troy:

1.100 ubi tot Simois correpta *sub undis*
*scuta virum galeasque et fortia corpora volv*it.[100]

The image of Simois whirling along in its waters shields and helmets, though influenced by *Iliad* 12.22-23, evokes above all Achilles' battle against the rivers of Troy in *Iliad* 21, where Scamander at one point complains that his waters are choked with corpses (218-20, cf. 234-39). At this point in the *Aeneid* the Trojans are still the victims of Achilles—*reliquias Danaum atque immitis Achilli* (1.30 = 3.87). The situation is reversed in Book 8, where the *signum Veneris* marks a new age and the immortal armor casts Aeneas in the role of a new Achilles, a role he readily accepts:

8.538 quas poenas mihi, Turne, dabis! quam multa *sub undas*
*scuta virum galeasque et fortia corpora volv*es
Thybri pater!

This image again recalls the Achilles of *Iliad* 21, but now the victim is on the way to becoming the victor. The repetition, which harks back to the storm scene, articulates this change from dark despair to renewed confidence in his mission.[101]

The reversal of Trojan fortunes in Italy is also marked by another repetition:

1.520 *postquam introgressi et coram data copia fandi,*
maximus Ilioneus *placido sic* pectore coepit:

[99] The parallels between the two scenes have been pointed out by Jens (1948).

[100] Cf. Austin's perceptive comment on 1.119: "The line repeats the pattern of 101; it is as if the horror of Troy is being re-enacted."

[101] See Heinze (1915: 325), Bömer (1944: 323-37), Otis (1964: 340-41), Knauer (1964: 257-59), Klingner (1967: 536-37). On the recurrence of the motif in the *Aeneid* see Raabe (1974: 79-83). Pöschl (1952: 138-39) rejects the optimistic view of the passage, for he finds the portent of Venus essentially baleful and the response of Aeneas a dutiful acceptance of a painful responsibility he can no longer shirk; but cf. Kühn's more moderate interpretation (1957: 52-57). Wiesen (1973: 759) also suggests that the verbal similarity with Book 1 "may point to an underlying psychological resemblance in the two passages."

11.248 *postquam introgressi et coram data copia fandi,*
munera praeferimus, nomen patriamque docemus,
qui bellum intulerint, quae causa attraxerit Arpos.
auditis ille haec *placido sic* reddidit ore:

No significance would normally be attached to a formula such as this, but there are several other parallels. First of all, *placido sic ore* (11.251) seems to be a reminiscence of *placido sic pectore* (1.521), which suggests that Vergil had the larger context of the scene in his mind. Both Ilioneus and Diomedes refer to Aeneas' piety and warlike strength:

1.544 rex erat Aeneas nobis, quo iustior alter
nec *pietate* fuit, nec bello maior et *armis*.

11.291 ambo animis, ambo insignes praestantibus *armis*,
hic *pietate* prior.

But whereas Ilioneus plays on the *pietas* of Aeneas and the Trojans to gain Dido's pity (*parce pio generi*, 1.526), Diomedes emphasizes the martial qualities to warn the Italians against fighting the Trojans (*ast armis concurrant arma cavete*, 11.293). In Book 1 Aeneas is absent and presumed dead, his *pietas* and *arma* are part of a past; or a potential future. By the time of the embassy in Book 11 this potential has become realized. Aeneas and his *arma* have had their impact on the field of battle, and the Trojans no longer have to plead from a position of weakness, as Ilioneus did. Then it would have been merely an act of barbarism to deny hospitality (1.539-41), but now to continue the war in the face of Trojan invincibility would be sheer madness (11.252-54).

Later in Book 11, when after Camilla's death the routed Rutulians try to get back to the city, they are cut down even by their own people, who in fear of the enemy have prematurely shut the gates:

11.883 pars claudere portas,
nec sociis aperire viam nec moenibus audent
accipere orantis, *oriturque miserrima caedes*
defendentum armis aditus inque arma ruentum.

The situation resembles the one in Book 2, where Aeneas and his band are mistaken for Greeks and attacked by the Trojans defending the temple of Minerva:

2.410 hic primum ex alto delubri culmine telis
nostrorum obruimur *oriturque miserrima caedes*
armorum facie et Graiarum errore iubarum.

While contextual similarity may have given rise to repetition, the contrast between Trojan defeat in Book 2 and Trojan victory in Book 11 must be

intentional, for the war in Italy is in many respects a reversal of the Trojan War.

The description of Aeneas' departure from Sicily,

5.778 *certatim socii feriunt mare et aequora verrunt;*
5.777 *prosequitur surgens a puppi ventus euntis...*

echoes earlier departures, and so by way of analogy and contrast helps to structure the account of Aeneas' long voyage. These lines are, of course, inspired by Homeric models (5.778 in particular derives from a common formula, cf. *Od.* 9.104, etc.), but we have already observed how Vergil often puts Homeric formulae to new use. This line had been used earlier in describing the departure from Actium:

3.290 *certatim socii feriunt mare et aequora verrunt.*

There are some obvious parallels between the two scenes: here the Trojans leave after holding the Ilian Games and head for Buthrotum, where Helenus will clarify their destination and direct Aeneas to seek out the Cumaean Sibyl; in Book 5 they set sail after the funeral games for Anchises and following Helenus' advice they head for Cumae, where the Sibyl will guide Aeneas through the underworld to Anchises and the glorious vision of the Roman future. Strictly speaking, this example belongs to the section on *Analogy*, but it is discussed here because it is linked with another set of associations suggesting a contrast. The departure from Sicily (5.777) repeats a line describing the trip from Delos to Crete:

3.130 *prosequitur surgens a puppi ventus euntis.*

That voyage, prompted by a misunderstanding of Apollo's oracle, contrasts with the present one in which Aeneas, guided by the clear instructions of Helenus, makes straight for Italy. His arrival at Cumae,

6.1 sic fatur lacrimans, classique immittit habenas
et tandem Euboicis *Cumarum adlabitur oris,*

recalls the arrival in Crete:

3.131 *et tandem* antiquis *Curetum adlabimur oris,*—

as if to further emphasize the antithesis between Crete and Italy, the false and true home of the Trojans.[102]

[102] Vergil may have got the idea for the contrast from Homer, for his repetitions (3.130 = 5.777) are based on a Homeric formula that occurs only twice in the *Odyssey* (11.6-7 = 12.148-49) and describes analogous events: first the departure of Odysseus from Circe to consult Teiresias and then his departure for Ithaca.

3. *Foreshadowing*

Foreshadowing is probably the most speculative form of thematic association, because it rests on the supposition that a repeated line directs the reader not only to connect certain scenes, but to infer something about their consequences.[103] This cannot be easily or unambiguously demonstrated, because the evidence lies along the thin line separating interpretation from fancy. Yet the psychological process involved here is not very complicated, for the technique relies on the mind's proclivity towards closure, so that the recurrence of part of a pattern will invariably evoke the complete *Gestalt*. To use literary terms, foreshadowing of this sort is ultimately related to synecdoche.[104]

A few possible examples of this type occurring in connection with the storms of Books 1 and 4 have been cited above (see pp. 75-78). But just as Juno's interventions are fraught with a sense of foreboding, so are those of her emissary Iris. Sent by Juno (4.693-94) to perform a task normally carried out by Persephone, she glides down,

4.701 *mille* trahens *varios adverso sole colores,*

and releases Dido from her suffering. Her association with Dido's death sets the tone for her later appearances. It may also have suggested the rainbow simile:

5.88 ceu nubibus arcus
mille iacit *varios adverso sole colores,*

which describes the snake that glides forth from the tomb of Anchises to partake of the funeral offerings. Though the omen seems good, the rainbow simile by evoking Iris creates some apprehension. It is not unfounded, for soon the image becomes reality as Juno sends Iris on a second errand:

5.606 *Irim de caelo misit Saturnia Iuno.*

[103] For a general study of foreshadowing in epic see Duckworth (1933: esp. 24-26, 57-60, 62-66). Duckworth allows the possibility of foreshadowing by analogy, but his discussion deals mostly with fairly overt symbolism and mythological *exempla*. He does not consider analogies evoked through verbal or thematic similarity, which is a more subtle form of foreshadowing. More recently Koch (1967: 113-126) has tried to show how in the Dido episode ambivalent language foreshadows Dido's death and the ultimate fall of Carthage. Cf. also Highet (1972: 185): "Sometimes...Vergil shows that an event is not what its participants believe, by introducing verbal allusions to another event with a different outcome."

[104] For thought patterns in Roman poetry that rely on synecdoche see G. Williams (1980: 21-30; *passim*).

Iris comes, incites the Trojan matrons to fire the ships, and leaves trailing a rainbow behind her:

5.657 cum dea *se paribus* per *caelum sustulit alis*
ingentemque fuga secuit sub nubibus arcum.

In Book 9 Juno again intervenes by sending Iris,

9.2 *Irim de caelo misit Saturnia Iuno,*

who instructs Turnus to attack the Trojan camp and leaves as she had before:

9.14 dixit, et in *caelum paribus se sustulit alis*
ingentemque fuga secuit sub nubibus arcum.

Nothing is said about burning the ships, but we expect it, because the verbal and structural parallels with Iris' earlier appearance suggest that this scene will end the same way.[105] It comes as no surprise that Turnus soon attacks the fleet and tries to set it on fire (9.69-76).

Foreshadowing also occurs in the latter part of Book 11, which relates the exploits of Camilla. Two strands of association are intertwined here. First of all, the description of Camilla strongly recalls the first appearance of Dido, which is framed by the representation of Penthesilea on the temple:

1.490 ducit Amazonidum *lunatis agmina peltis*
Penthesilea furens mediisque in milibus ardet,
aurea subnectens exsertae cingula mammae
bellatrix, audetque viris concurrere virgo,

and by the Diana simile (1.498-502). The image of Penthesilea is clearly meant to suggest Dido's manly daring and potential destructiveness, just as Diana depicts her chaste beauty. The later comparison of Camilla to Hippolyte or Penthesilea,

11.661 seu circum Hippolyten seu cum se Martia curru
Penthesilea refert, magnoque ululante tumultu
feminea exsultant *lunatis agmina peltis*—

in turn tends to evoke not only the temple mural, but Dido as well. Camilla's relationship to Diana, unlike Dido's, is not just figurative but real, for she stands under the special protection of the goddess, and that

[105] Worstbrock (1963: 116-117) remarks on the functional and verbal parallels of the two Iris scenes, and he points out how each third of the *Aeneid* begins with an intervention of Juno aimed at destroying the ships. In both Books 1 and 5 the loss leads to the temptation to settle and abandon the quest altogether; in Book 9 the transformation signals a permanent settlement.

probably determines the nature of her arms. Nevertheless, the mention of the quiver (11.649) and the *arma Dianae* (11.652) also call to mind the Diana simile, and by association Dido. The death of Camilla had already been predicted by Diana (11.587-94), but the allusions to Dido add a tragic dimension and suggest impending doom.

Another repetition links Camilla with the priest Chloreus, whom she eagerly pursues:

11.774 *aureus ex umeris* erat *arcus et* aurea vati
cassida.

Camilla's own arms had earlier been described in very similar language:

11.652 *aureus ex umero* sonat *arcus et* arma Dianae.

The richness of her arms implies vanity and explains what drew her to Chloreus. But the repetition also identifies hunter with hunted, anticipating how the death Camilla hopes to inflict will be hers at the hands of Arruns, who stalks her as relentlessly as she does Chloreus.

When in Book 4 Dido sees the Trojans preparing for departure, she turns to tears and supplication in a desperate attempt to change Aeneas' mind:

4.412 improbe Amor, *quid non mortalia pectora cogis!*
ire iterum in lacrimas, iterum temptare precando
cogitur et supplex animos summittere amori,
ne quid inexpertum frustra moritura relinquat.

Vergil's apostrophe on the baleful power of *Amor* echoes a similar line from the account of Polydorus' death at the hands of the Thracian king:

3.56 *quid non mortalia pectora cogis,*
auri sacra fames!

The reminiscence emphasizes the potential destructiveness of Dido's love by suggesting that passion, like greed, can erupt into violence. It foreshadows not so much her suicide, as the danger she may pose for Aeneas and the Trojans. That is why Mercury urges Aeneas to leave in a hurry; he fears her *dolos dirumque nefas* (4.563), the nature of which becomes abundantly clear in the monologue that follows Aeneas' departure (4.600-606).

The ominous aspect of *improbe Amor*, made more specific by the recollection of Polydorus' murder, is also supported by the Apollonian apostrophe that served as a model:

Arg. 4.445 Σχέτλι' Ἔρως, μέγα πῆμα, μέγα στύγος ἀνθρώποισιν.

Love caused Medea to murder her brother, not to mention what she did later. There can be little doubt that Vergil was thinking not only of this line, but of the whole Apollonian context, for the confrontation between Dido and Aeneas (4.296-392) is largely patterned after the scene between Medea and Jason which results in the plot against Apsyrtus (*Arg.* 4.350-420).[106]

Several repetitions linking Mezentius with Turnus furnish another example of foreshadowing. The intervention of Lausus (10.789-90) interrupts the initial encounter between Aeneas and his father, thus enabling Mezentius to withdraw to safety, but not for long, because soon his men return with the body of slain Lausus:

10.841 at Lausum socii exanimem super arma ferebant
flentes, *ingentem atque ingenti vulnere victum.*

Beside himself with grief and shame Mezentius rushes back into the fray to kill Aeneas or meet his own death:

10.870 sic cursum in medios rapidus dedit. *aestuat ingens*
uno in corde pudor mixtoque insania luctu.

In Book 12 the duel between Turnus and Aeneas is initially prevented by the truce-breaking spear of Tolumnius. For a while Juturna is able to delay the inevitable, but Turnus recognizes her and insists on facing Aeneas. Considerations not unlike those of Mezentius motivate his decision, for he is overcome by a deep sense of shame at having failed his friends and companions. Ufens is dead (12.641) and Murranus:

12.638 vidi oculos ante ipse meos me voce vocantem
Murranum, quo non superat mihi carior alter,
oppetere *ingentem atque ingenti vulnere victum.*

And when wounded Saces arrives to urge Turnus to defend the city, he reacts like Mezentius:

12.665 obstipuit varia confusus imagine rerum
Turnus et obtutu tacito stetit; *aestuat ingens*
uno in corde pudor mixtoque insania luctu
et furiis agitatus amor et conscia virtus.[107]

---

[106] There are a number of other parallels: 296-304 = *Arg.* 4.350-54; 311 = *Arg.* 4.389; 307 = *Arg.* 4.358-59; 320 = *Arg.* 4.364; 360 = *Arg.* 4.395; 382-87 = *Arg.* 4.382-87; 604-606 = *Arg.* 4.391-93. We should also note that in *E* 8.47-50 *Amor* is twice called *improbus* for causing Medea to kill her children, so that *improbe Amor* is in every way connected with violence and murder. Cf. Highet (1972: 185).

[107] Cf. Otis (1964: 376 n1): "the reference to Mezentius is of course intentional: Mezentius is a 'surrogate' for the absent Turnus."

Even the deaths of Mezentius and Turnus follow a similar pattern: both are first wounded by Aeneas' spear and then dispatched with the sword, both concede victory and ask for burial. It is not surprising that some similarity should exist between the two most formidable opponents of Aeneas, but when repetition anticipates such similarity at the beginning, we are led to expect that the outcome of the scenes will also be the same.

CHAPTER FOUR

PATTERNS OF ASSOCIATION

Classification dislocates what it seeks to distinguish. The naming of parts does not help us find the *disiecti membra poetae*; we must see them in motion to know what we have got. Thus repetitions cannot be fully understood in isolation, because their significance depends on how they connect with each other and with the rest of the poem. And only by following such connections do we come to discern the patterns and poetic logic behind them. Some of this has been brought out in the examples already discussed, but the repetitions best read back into their contexts are those associated with Aeneas and Dido.

A. *Aeneas*

1. *The Great Tradition*

Several repetitions link Aeneas to his ancestors and descendents. The most striking example is the description of Augustus at Actium on the Shield of Aeneas:

8.678 hinc Augustus agens Italos in proelia Caesar
cum patribus popul*oque*, *penatibus et magnis dis*,
stans celsa in puppi, geminas cui tempora flammas
laeta vomunt patriumque aperitur vertice sidus.

His cause is identified with Rome and its gods, who stand on his side (8.699-701, 704) to oppose the monstrous oriental divinities championing Antony (8.698), but Augustus' association with the Roman *penates* and *magni di* becomes even more significant if we recall Aeneas' departure from Troy:

3.11 feror exsul in altum
cum sociis nat*oque penatibus et magnis dis*.

Augustus is seen as the direct heir of Aeneas and the guardian of the *patrii penates* (2.717) rescued from the flames of Troy.[1]

[1] The association between Augustus and the Penates is especially close, because he had restored their temple on the Velia (cf. *Mon. Anc.* 19). Servius (on 3.12) identifies *penates* and *magni di*, citing Varro as his authority: *unum esse dicit penates et magnos deos; nam in basi scribebatur MAGNIS DIIS.* Lloyd (1956: 41-46) suggests that Vergil may be quoting the inscription on the statue base of the *penates publici* in the Velia shrine. Such an echo would further strengthen the identification between Aeneas and Augustus, the preserver and the restorer of the Penates. Cf. also Fowler (1918: 111-13), Bacon (1939: 101-102), Perret (1952: 103-104), A. Parry (1963: 73), and Binder (1971: 219-24).

The identification between Aeneas and Augustus is further emphasized through the repetition of the phrase *stans celsa in puppi*, which first appears in Book 3 describing Anchises as he pours a libation to the gods after sighting Italy:

3.525 tum pater Anchises magnum cratera corona
induit implevitque mero, divosque vocavit
stans celsa in puppi.

The stern is of course the proper place for the captain of a ship or commander of a fleet (cf. 5.132-33), and hence it sometimes comes to symbolize the command itself and the proper exercise thereof.[2] For this reason it may be significant that on the night before his departure from Carthage Aeneas is pictured sleeping on the lofty stern of his ship:

4.554 Aeneas *celsa in puppi* iam certus eundi
carpebat somnos rebus iam rite paratis.

For the first time since the death of his father Aeneas seems to have finally taken command, and *certus eundi* he rests at his post to be ready for the journey ahead.[3] The phrase recurs for the last time in Book 10 when Aeneas returns with reinforcements for the beleaguered Trojan camp:

10.260 iamque in conspectu Teucros habet et sua castra
stans celsa in puppi, clipeum cum deinde sinistra
extulit ardentem.

The repetition is important here, because more than ever before Aeneas has now assumed the role destined for him (cf. *quem numina poscunt*, 8.512 and *ego poscor Olympo*, 8.533), but even more significantly, the shield he holds up to signal his approach has at its center the figure of Augustus *stans celsa in puppi* (8.680) at Actium, victorious before the fleeing hordes of Antony and Cleopatra. Thus an apparently formulaic phrase not only reinforces the links between Augustus, Aeneas, and Anchises, but by recalling the victory at Actium it also foreshadows the victory of Aeneas in the present war.[4]

The rest of the description of Augustus is also highly unusual:

8.680 *geminas* cui *tempora flammas*
laeta *vom*unt patriumque aperitur *vertice sidus*.

[2] Conington on 3.527: "Anchises stands on the stern, which was the sacred part of the vessel, containing the representations of its tutelary gods. So 10.171." Cf. Cicero, *Fam.* 9.15.3: *sedebamus in puppi et clavum tenebamus* (cf. *Fam.* 12.15). See also Highet (1972: 35).

[3] Shortly before the departure from Sicily Aeneas is again singled out, this time standing prominently on the prow and, like Anchises, pouring libations (5.775-76).

[4] On the identification among Anchises, Aeneas and Augustus see also Bacon (1939: 102), Elder (1954: 94), Commager (1957: 111), and Benario (1967: 26).

The twin flames rising from his temples may evoke the double-crested helmet of Romulus in 6.779,[5] but the fire and star associated with Augustus at Actium also suggest a number of other passages, such as the description of Aeneas' helmet in Book 8:

8.620 terribilem cristis galeam *flammas*que *vom*entem,

and particularly the flame which in Book 2 suddenly burst forth from the crown of Iulus:

2.682 ecce levis summo de *vertice* visus Iuli
FUNDere lumen APEX, tactuque innoxia mollis
lambere *flamma* comas et circum *tempora* pasci,[6]

an omen that in response to Anchises' prayer was immediately confirmed by a shooting star (2.694, 700). Apart from the repetition of isolated words, this passage contains two striking elements associated with Augustus at Actium: the flame around his temples and the *patrium sidus* (cf. *stella* and *sidus* in Book 2). The *augurium maximum*, which heralds the beginning of a new era, thus reappears thematically in the description of the battle of Actium, marking that victory as another turning-point in Rome's history.

But the train of associations continues. The return of Aeneas in Book 10 picks up the fire imagery of the earlier scenes, for not only does he hold up his blazing (*ardentem*, 10.262) shield, but flames also shoot from his helmet and crest:

10.270 ardet APEX capiti cristisque a *vertice flamma*
FUNDitur et vastos umbo *VOM*it aureus ignis.

The word *apex* is relatively rare, so that its occurrence both here and in Book 2 seems striking, even though the meaning may not be quite the same.[7] Surely we are dealing here with more than just the sun's rays

[5] Romulus was one of the titles proposed for Augustus (cf. Suet. *Aug.* 7); the two are linked in Prop. 4.6.41-44. Cf. Scott (1925), Getty (1950), and Binder (1971: 153-69).

[6] Also relevant here is the flame which burns around the head of Lavinia (7.73-77). This omen seems to parallel the one in Book 2, but unlike the *augurium*, which symbolizes the future glory of the race descended from Ascanius, it seems applicable to Lavinia alone, symbolizing her individual fame (cf. 7.79-80). She is merely an adjunct to the grand patriarchal tradition embodied by Anchises, Aeneas, Ascanius, and Augustus, and that is perhaps why she is not linked with them (as they are) through verbal repetition.

[7] In 10.270 *apex* is the tip of Aeneas' helmet, but in 2.683 the meaning is less clear. Cerda's view that it describes the pointed tongue of the flame has the support of similar expressions in Ovid (*Met.* 10.279, *Pont.* 4.9.54, *Fast.* 6.636) and is preferred by many modern scholars. Ti. Donatus (followed by Henry) thought *apex* to be the crown of Iulus' head (cf. 10.270), but that seems less appropriate after *summo de vertice*. The interpretation of Servius (on 2.683) that it is a cap similar to the *pilleus* worn by the *flamines*, whom Ascanius himself is said to have established at Alba, places the cart before the horse. If there is a connection

reflected by the highly polished armor, for in momentous situations like these even natural phenomena take on symbolic meaning. It is in the light of such symbolic interpretation that the parallels with the *augurium maximum* begin to make sense, as does the simile which follows:

10.272 non secus ac liquida si quando nocte cometae
sanguinei lugubre rubent, aut Sirius ardor
ille sitim morbosque ferens mortalibus aegris
nascitur et laevo contristat lumine caelum.

While there are Homeric parallels for the imagery and the star simile,[8] the mention of *cometae* is a rather unusual amplification of the Homeric model, but one that is very appropriate here, for it recalls the shooting star—*stella facem ducens*—which had confirmed the fire omen in Book 2,[9] and the comet which appeared during the funeral games for Julius Caesar in 44 B.C.—the *patrium sidus* which attends Augustus on the Shield of Aeneas.[10] Thus the description of Aeneas' return contains references to both the Trojan past and the Augustan future. The omens which had sanctioned his flight from Troy reappear in imagistic form to suggest divine support for his present endeavor, whereas the associations with Augustus at Actium have the effect of foreshadowing victory itself.[11]

between Ascanius and the *flamines*, it is more likely that Vergil would have understood the flame-like tuft of the *pilleus* as a possible imitation of the fiery *apex* that had appeared on the crown of Iulus, rather than have Iulus wear a *pilleus* in anticipation of its later use by the *flamines*. Cf. also Conington and Austin on 2.683.

[8] The primary model is Achilles' appearance at the Greek wall in *Il.* 18.205-13, which is combined with the Sirius simile from *Il.* 22.26-31 (see also Knauer 1964: 298). Star images also characterize other heroes: *Il.* 5.4-6 (Diomedes) and 11.62-63 (Hector). The references to Sirius and to comets also have baleful implications, on which see Hornsby (1970: 34-35), Boyle (1972: 66).

[9] Ancient descriptions do not seem to have differentiated between meteorites and comets. Cf. Servius D. (on 10.272) citing Avienus on comets: *stella, quae obliquam facem post se trahens quasi crinem facit, Hippius vocatur*, where the language closely corresponds to Vergil's description of a shooting star: *stella facem ducens* (2.694). For other descriptions of comets see *G* 1.365-67, Lucr. 2.206-208, 5.1191. The comet simile might also evoke the arrow of Acestes, which catches fire and is compared to a meteor:

5.526 *signa*vit*que via*m flammis tenuisque recessit
consumpta in ventos, caelo ceu saepe refixa
transcurrunt crinemque volantia sidera ducunt.

But Acestes' omen is more closely linked with the *augurium maximum*, from which it even echoes the phrase *signa*ntem*que vias* (2.697). Hornsby (1970: 44-45) stresses the ambivalent nature of the omen.

[10] Suet. *Iul.* 88, *Georg.* 1.488 (*nec diri totiens arsere cometae*). Servius D. (also on 10.272) cites Avienus on another comet which appeared when Augustus assumed power.

[11] Binder (1971: 224-30) has the most thorough recent discussion of the associations between Aeneas and Augustus. See also Wlosok (1967: 133 n123), Grassmann-Fischer (1966: 19-28), Buchheit (1972: 34-35, 82-90, 185), Halter (1963: 45-55), Basson (1975: 16-35).

2. *Dardanus*

The arrival of Aeneas in Italy is seen as a return to his ancestral homeland (cf. *antiquam exquirite matrem*, 3.96), which Dardanus long ago had left for Troy. This contrast between the journeys of Aeneas and Dardanus is brought out by a repetition in the two speeches of Latinus before the Trojan embassy. He bids the Trojans welcome and reminisces:

7.205 atque equidem memini (fama est obscurior annis)
Auruncos ita ferre senes, h*is ortus* ut agris
Dardanus Idaeas Phrygiae penetrarit ad urbes
Threiciamque Samum, quae nunc Samothracia fertur.
hi*nc illum* Coryth*i* Tyrrh*ena ab sede profectum*
aurea nunc solio stellantis regia caeli
accipit et numerum divorum altaribus auget.

The reply of Ilioneus confirms the Italian origin of Dardanus with a phrase (*hinc Dardanus ortus*, 7.240) that harks back to the prophecy of the Penates:

3.167 hae nobis propriae sedes, *hinc Dardanus ortus*
Iasiusque pater, genus a quo principe nostrum.

As Latinus ponders what Ilioneus had said, he recalls the prophecy of Faunus (*externi venient generi*, 7.98), realizing that its conditions have now been fulfilled by the coming of Aeneas:

7.254 et veteris Fauni volvit sub pectore sortem:
nu*nc illum* fat*is* ext*erna ab sede profectum*
portendi generum paribusque in regna vocari
auspiciis.

The verbal echo suggests that the circle is now complete, for just as Dardanus had once voyaged from Italy to Troy, so now Aeneas has made the return journey to the land of his forefathers.[12]

3. *Pietatis imago*

The theme of filial devotion repeatedly draws attention to the *pietas* of Aeneas and, in a lesser degree, that of Ascanius. Both react to images of *pietas* by identifying with them. Thus the solicitous concern of Euryalus for his mother strikes a familiar chord in Ascanius:

9.294 atque animu*m patriae* strinx*it pietatis imago*.

The same phrase appears in Book 10 as Aeneas (aptly called *Anchisiades*)[13] beholds Lausus slain defending his father and remembers his own love for Anchises:

[12] This example of ring-composition has already been observed by Newton (1953: 183).
[13] Cf. Conington on 10.822; also Fowler (1918: 87-88), Otis (1964: 359), Hahn (1920-21: 3-4), G. Williams (1968: 729-30), and W. R. Johnson (1976: 72-75).

10.824 et mente*m patriae* SUBI*IT pietatis imago*.

This is not the first time a situation reminds Aeneas of his devotion to his father, for already in Book 2 the spectacle of Priam's death had led him to fear for the safety of Anchises:

2.560 SUBI*IT* cari genitor*is imago*,
ut regem aequaevum crudeli vulnere vidi
vitam exhalantem.

As Aeneas carries his father out of the flames of Troy he becomes the embodiment of *pietas*, and it is this same devotion that drives him to the underworld to see Anchises, as he declares when challenged by Charon at the Styx:

6.403 Troius Aeneas, pietate insignis et armis,
ad genitorem imas Erebi descendit ad umbras.
si te nulla movet tantae *pietatis imago*, ...

Vergil is consistent in using the phrase *pietatis imago* to describe the filial love of Aeneas for Anchises and of Ascanius for Aeneas. Their reaction to the examples of Euryalus and Lausus illumines their own *pietas*, while the repetition between Books 9 and 10 suggests that this *pietas* is a distinctive trait of the race of Anchises.

4. *Augurium maximum*

A number of repetitions are patterned after the description of the omens in Book 2, which Servius D. (on 2.693) calls an *augurium maximum*:

2.687 AT PATER ANCHISES oculos ad sidera laetus
extulit *et* caelo *palmas* cum *voc*e te*tend*it:
'*Iuppiter omnipotens*, precibus *si* flecteris ullis,
aspice nos, hoc tantum, et *si pietate* meremur,
da deinde auxilium, *pater*, *atque* haec omina firma.'
*vix ea fatus era*t senior, subitoque fragore
intonuit laevum.

When the Trojans arrive at Delos, Aeneas prays to Apollo for guidance in very similar language:

3.89 '*da*, *pater*, augurium *atque* animis inlabere nostris.'
*vix ea fatus era*m: ...

In Troy it was Anchises who exercised the priestly function of the *pater familias* by praying for an additional sign (*augurium impetrativum*) to confirm the fire omen around the head of Ascanius (*augurium oblativum*). In Book 3 he gradually yields that role to Aeneas. The earlier omens had induced Anchises to leave Troy, now further ones prevent Aeneas from settling in

Thrace. The blood dripping from the torn cornel and myrtle branches (3.27-29) constitutes an *augurium oblativum*, and Aeneas prays for another omen (*impetrativum*) to render the adverse sign harmless (3.34-36). The voice of Polydorus which then issues forth with its *heu fuge* (3.44) recalls the words of Hector (2.289), but it gives no guidance, and that is why Aeneas must consult Apollo. It is strange, however, that in his prayer at Delos he should ask for an omen (*augurium*, 3.89) rather than for an oracular response. The term *augurium* has been explained as a loose variant of *oraclum* (so Conington), but Vergil could easily have substituted the latter (cf. 3.143), had he wished to do so.

It seems more likely that Aeneas repeats the words of Anchises because Vergil wished to place the consultation of Apollo within the context of the *augurium maximum*, one of the few instances where Jupiter himself sends an omen to direct human events. Apollo's oracle is meant to reinforce the omens of his father, not supplant them. That is perhaps why Aeneas asks for an *augurium* and addresses Apollo as *pater* (3.89). To be sure, Servius' note on the passage shows that *pater* is the proper epithet for all the gods, but the phrase *da, pater augurium* not inappropriately calls to mind the father of gods and men, who is the source of Apollo's inspiration. This echo is further supported by the repetition *vix ea fatus era*m (3.90 = 2.692),[14] which strengthens the link between Jupiter's omen and Apollo's prophecy, and suggests that Aeneas, like Anchises, stands in a special relationship to the gods.

Elements of the original *augurium maximum* also recur in Book 5, although here the parallels are primarily thematic rather than verbal. The shooting star that buries itself in the Idaean woods and points the way for the Trojans (*sign*antem*que via*s, 2.697) finds its counterpart in the fiery arrow of Acestes (*signa*vit*que via*m flammis, 5.526),[15] while the fire thrown on the ships at Iris' instigation may be compared to the flames surrounding the head of Iulus, though this time not harmless (*tactuque innoxia*, 2.683), but obviously destructive (5.682-83). Attempts to extinguish the fires (5.684, 2.685-86) are in vain. In the midst of all this confusion Aeneas, like Anchises in Book 2 (cf. *at pater Anchises*, 2.687), raises his hands in prayer to Jupiter:

[14] Although the phrase occurs a total of eight times in the *Aeneid*, when joined with *da, pater augurium* it forms a striking combination. Norden (on 6.190) believes that *vix ea fatus erat* is a 'Zitat' from Ennius (cf. *Ann.* 47, 59: *haec effatus*, and Varro *Sat. Men.* 494: *vix effatus erat*). Austin (on 6.190) remarks that the formula keeps recurring "in a context of the supernatural". The latter would make the phrase even more effective, while an Ennian reminiscence would give the scenes an archaic coloration quite in keeping with their solemnity and importance.

[15] Cf. Galinsky (1968: 177-78) and above, note 9.

5.685 TUM PIUS AENEAS umeris abscindere vestem
auxilioque *voc*are deos *et tend*ere *palmas*:
'*Iuppiter omnipotens*, *si* nondum exosus ad unum
Troianos, *si* quid *pietas* antiqua labores
respicit humanos, *da* flammam evadere classi
nunc, *pater*, et tenuis Teucrum res eripe leto.
vel tu, quod superest, infesto fulmine morti,
si mereor, demitte tuaque hic obrue dextra.'
vix haec edid*erat* cum effusis imbribus atra
tempestas sine more furit tonitruque tremescunt
ardua terrarum et campi.

Some structural and verbal similarity between the two prayers is perhaps inevitable,[16] but when further supported by thematic parallels, it does evoke the *augurium maximum*, and that at a crucial point in Aeneas' journey. Juno's last attempt to keep the Trojans from reaching Italy by destroying their fleet is an unexpected setback, and it makes Aeneas doubt his mission. His prayer to Jupiter for rescue or death is motivated by a need for a further sign of divine will (*augurium impetrativum*), for the burning fleet constitutes a baleful omen (*oblativum*) that must be refuted by an auspicious one, if the Trojans are to reach Italy. Jupiter's answer is clear. The rainstorm nullifies the fire omen and saves the ships, while the thunderclaps provide additional confirmation of his support. By repeating the pattern of the *augurium maximum* here (and to some extent when describing the consultation of Apollo) Vergil has managed to reaffirm the validity of the original omens and the immutability of Aeneas' destiny.

5. *Prayers and Sacrifices*

In the *Aeneid* only four prayers are addressed exclusively to Jupiter, they all begin with *Iuppiter omnipotens* (2.689, 4.206, 5.687, 9.625), and (with one exception) are spoken by members of Aeneas' family. The exception, however, is such that it confirms the function and significance of the other parallels; thus:

Anchises' prayer in Book 2 clarifies Jupiter's will and precipitates an auspicious departure from Troy. Throughout the following book Anchises, though less prominent than before, retains his role as the guiding spirit of the voyage. His death at the end of that book leaves Aeneas exposed to the machinations of Juno. When after the hunt he

[16] A request for divine aid is generally prefaced with a reference to one's own *pietas*, e.g. *Il.* 1.37-42, where Chryses' past services to Apollo are likewise expressed in the form of a double protasis. *Pater* is particularly appropriate in the case Jupiter, and *da* also seems to be fairly common in prayers (cf. Lucr. 1.28; *A* 3.85, 6.66, 12.97; and *dos* in *Il.* 24.309).

appears ready to stay with Dido indefinitely and help build Carthage, there is no one to remind him of his destiny and duty.[17] In this situation Iarbas assumes the role normally performed by Anchises. Although he knows nothing of fate's decree and is moved not by concern for Aeneas's mission but by jealousy, his prayer,

4.206 *Iuppiter omnipotens*, cui nunc Maurusia pictis
gens epulata toris Lenaeum libat honorem,
*aspic*is haec? ...

may recall the words of Anchises:

2.689 *Iuppiter omnipotens*, precibus si flecteris ullis,
*aspic*e nos.

It does at any rate have a similar effect, for it sets in motion the whole divine machinery that shocks Aeneas to his senses and causes him to leave Carthage in a hurry. Aeneas' prayer in Book 5 follows the same pattern, as we have already seen, and like the preceding examples it occurs at a point when his mission seems to be seriously endangered.

The prayer of Ascanius in Book 9 continues the pattern at a particularly critical time, for the Trojans are cut off from Aeneas by Turnus and in danger of losing what they have barely grasped. Moreover, Numanus questions not only the manliness of the Trojans (see above, pp. 107-108), but their destiny as well:

9.601 quis deus Italiam, quae vos dementia adegit?

His taunt seems to mock what Ilioneus had said to Latinus:

7.239 sed nos fata deum vestras exquirere terras
imperiis egere suis.

Conington (on 9.601) correctly suggests that "Numanus may mean to intimate that the oracles which led the Trojans to Italy are merely a madman's delusion." Such a challenge cannot be disregarded, and the prayer of Ascanius to the god whose omens had motivated the departure from Troy,

9.625 *Iuppiter omnipotens*, audacibus adnue coeptis,

effectively emphasizes that there is more to be vindicated than just Trojan valor. Jupiter hears and responds with a thunderclap on the left as the arrow leaves the bow:

[17] The role of Anchises, as Knauer has pointed out, corresponds to that of Odysseus' companions, for just as Odysseus loses all of them by the time he reaches Ogygia, so Vergil has Anchises die in Sicily (contrary to the Roman tradition) shortly before Aeneas' arrival at Carthage. Cf. Knauer (1964: 216, 190-92, 340 n3).

9.630 audiit et caeli genitor de parte serena
intonuit laevum, sonat una fatifer arcus.

It is an auspicious beginning for young Ascanius, but the import of the omen transcends the present scene, for we recognize in it elements from the *augurium maximum* (*Iuppiter omnipotens*, 2.689; *intonuit laevum*, 2.693). These echoes help equate Ascanius with Anchises and Aeneas as a worthy carrier of Rome's destiny, whose *pietas* and *virtus*, like that of his forebears, find divine recognition.

Ascanius demonstrates his piety by promising a sacrifice to Jupiter:

9.626 ipse tibi ad tua templa feram sollemnia dona,
et *statuam ante aras* aurata fronte IUVENCUM
candentem pariterque caput cum matre ferentem,
iam cornu petat et pedibus qui spargat harenam.

In so doing he follows a pattern set by Cloanthus,[18] who in the boat race vows a similar sacrifice to the gods of the sea:

5.235 di, quibus imperium est pelagi, quorum aequora curro,
vobis laetus ego hoc *candentem* in litore TAURUM
con*stituam ante aras* voti reus,

and is rewarded with victory over Mnestheus, who, though not lacking in *virtus*, forgets that it must be tempered through *pietas*.

But, as Kraggerud has shown, the boat race symbolizes the voyage of Aeneas (see Ch. 3, pp. 124-25), and hence Cloanthus is even more important as a model for Aeneas. The conclusion of Cloanthus' vow,

5.237 *extaque salsos*
*proici*am *in fluctus* et *vina liquentia fund*am,

is echoed in the description of Aeneas' sacrifice before the departure from Sicily:

5.774 ipse caput tonsae foliis evinctus olivae
stans procul in prora pateram tenet, *extaque salsos*
*proici*t *in fluctus* ac *vina liquentia fund*it.

The implication of this parallel is that Aeneas, like Cloanthus, will meet with success.[19] The vow of Cloanthus is followed by the appearance of the whole Nereid band which helps his ship to victory:

5.239 DIXit, eumque imis sub fluctibus audiit *omnis*
Nereidum *Phorcique chorus Panopeaque virgo*,
et pater ipse manu magna Portunus euntem

[18] Cf. Kraggerud (1968: 152-53).
[19] Cf. Putnam (1965: 93).

IMPULIT: ILLA Noto CITIUS volucrique SAGITTA
ad terram FUGIT et portu se condidit alto.

This anticipates the later scene in which Neptune, having promised Venus that Aeneas will safely reach Italy (*tutus...portus accedet Averni*, 5.813) goes forth with his chariot and usual retinue to calm the sea:

5.822 tum variae comitum facies, immania cete,
et senior Glauci *chorus* Inousque Palaemon
Tritonesque citi *Phorcique* exercitus *omnis*;
laeva tenet Thetis et Melite *Panopeaque virgo*,
Nisaee Spioque Thaliaque Cymodoceque.

And part of the motif is picked up again in Book 10, where Cymodocea speaking for the recently metamorphosed ships of the Trojans foretells Aeneas' success in the upcoming battle and speeds his ships to their destination:

10.246 DIXerat et dextra discedens IMPULIT altam
haud ignara modi puppim: FUGIT ILLA per undas
OCIOR et iaculo et ventos aequante SAGITTA.

These echoes are admittedly rather faint, but given the more obvious repetition between the vow of Cloanthus and the sacrifice of Aeneas, they seem to give further support to the view that the victory of Cloanthus is meant to foreshadow that of Aeneas.

When Ascanius urges Nisus to summon Aeneas from Pallanteum, he invokes the household gods and Vesta:

9.258 excipit Ascanius 'per magnos, Nise, penatis
Assaraci*que larem et canae penetralia Vestae*
obtestor...'

We may recall the sacrifice of Aeneas after the nocturnal visitation of Anchises:

5.743 haec memorans cinerem et sopitos suscitat ignis,
Pergameum*que larem et canae penetralia Vestae*
farre pio et plena supplex veneratur acerra.

Although Aeneas also sacrifices after other supernatural appearances (e.g. 3.176-78, 8.542-44), this seems to be the only instance where Vesta and the Lar are involved. Both had been rescued by Aeneas from Troy (cf. 2.293, 296-97, 717, 747) and are probably identical with the *di patrii* Anchises addresses after the *augurium*:

2.702 *di patrii*; servate domum, servate nepotem.
vestrum hoc augurium, vestroque in *numine Troia est.*[20]

[20] Grassmann-Fischer (1966: 17) identifies the *di patrii* with the Penates.

These are the protecting divinities of Troy, and later of Rome, who are invoked in times of peril, and whom Vergil himself beseeches in the *Georgics* to allow Augustus to set right an age out of joint:

G 1.498 *di patrii* Indigetes et Romule *Vesta*que mater,
quae Tuscum Tiberim et Romana Palatia servas,
hunc saltem everso iuvenem succurrere saeclo
ne prohibete.

The burning of the ships had produced a crisis serious enough to make Aeneas doubt his mission and consider settling in Sicily *oblitus fatorum* (5.703). Only the sage advice of Nautes and the appearance of Anchises prevail upon him to continue, and he worships the Lar and Vesta, presumably to reaffirm his devotion to Troy's destiny and plead for their continuing support. In Book 9 the war predicted by Anchises has become reality and the Trojans, temporarily without Aeneas, are particularly vulnerable. Yet there is hope. In the resolute courage of Nisus and Euryalus aged Aletes sees a sign of divine favor, and with an echo of Anchises' words he exclaims:

9.247 *di patrii*, quorum semper sub *numine Troia est*,
non tamen omnino Teucros delere paratis,
cum talis animos iuvenum et tam certa tulistis
pectora.

Ascanius, however, realizes that safety and victory ultimately hinge on Aeneas (*sola salus genitore reducto*, 9.257), and his invocation of the Penates, Lar, and Vesta recalls Aeneas' role as savior and guardian of the gods of the household and the state.

6. *The Aristeia of Ascanius*

We have seen how in Book 9 Ascanius is repeatedly marked as a worthy heir to Aeneas by the qualities he exhibits: his clear devotion to the cause, his pious regard of the gods, and his *virtus*. The victory over Numanus gives proof of the latter, while the divine approval implicit in Jupiter's omen and expressed by Apollo places this victory in the larger context of Rome's destiny:

9.641 macte nova virtute, puer, sic itur ad astra,
dis genite et geniture deos. iure omnia bella
gente sub Assaraci fato ventura resident,
nec te Troia capit.

Yet the appearance of Apollo seems somewhat otiose. Its ostensible purpose is to check Ascanius' eagerness for battle, but it is not immediately

clear why Apollo should perform this function rather than Mercury, especially since his arrival and departure are described in a manner recalling the two appearances of Mercury in Book 4. Apollo descends, having assumed the shape of Ascanius' aged companion Butes:

9.650 *omnia* longaevo *similis vocemque coloremque*
et crinis albos *et* saeva sonoribus arma,—

while Mercury appears to Aeneas undisguised:

4.558 *omnia* Mercurio *similis, vocemque coloremque*
et crinis flavos *et* membra decora iuventa.

Having said his piece, Apollo vanishes into thin air:

9.657 *mortalis medio* aspectus *sermone reliquit*
et procul in tenuem ex oculis evanuit auram,—

just as Mercury had done after delivering Jupiter's command to Aeneas:

4.277 *mortalis* visus *medio sermone reliquit*
et procul in tenuem ex oculis evanuit auram.

The repeated lines are rather unusual, containing a hypermetric *-que* (4.558 = 9.650) and the rare use of the singular *aura* after a preposition (4.278 = 9.658),[21] so that it seems unlikely that they are accidents. Sparrow (p. 106) believes that the whole passage is unrevised and perhaps detachable from the rest. What has already been said about the importance of Ascanius' *aristeia* would preclude the latter. The argument for the lack of revision rests primarily on the repetitions in question.[22] If these are stop-gaps, they are rather well integrated into the context. They do not have the appearance of formulae merely inserted so as to sustain the flow of inspiration, for not only is there careful rearrangement of words, but also more subtle echoing of sound and rhythm (cf. 9.651, 4.559) suggesting a preoccupation with the particular scenes rather than with isolated formulaic expressions.[23] But then if they are not stop-gaps, one should

[21] Cf. Wagner, *Quaest. Virg.* IX, p. 409, cited by Austin on 4.277.

[22] The triple repetition of *Apollo* at verse end in close proximity (649, 654, 656) could be cited as another flaw, but as we have seen (above, pp. 33-35 and note 21), bacchiac and amphibrachic words are generally restricted to the end of the verse, and in a scene as short as this such iteration may have been unavoidable. Whether that would have been felt as objectionable is difficult to tell, for there is similar repetition in *E* 10.37-41, *E* 9.10-18, *E* 5.52-61, *E* 5.8-18.

[23] There are some structural parallels between the appearances of Mercury and Apollo. Both are preceded by a prayer (*Iuppiter omnipotens*, 4.206 = 9.625), which Jupiter hears (4.220, 9.630) and to which he responds by sending Mercury to Aeneas and a favorable omen to Ascanius. The omen is then followed by the epiphany of Apollo. Unlike Mercury, he seems to be acting on his own, but then Apollo is no mere messenger conveying instructions.

inquire why Vergil chose to represent the appearance of Apollo in a way recalling the two appearances of Mercury.

The intervention of Apollo in this scene may be patterned after Homer,[24] but more relevant here is his role as the god of archery, the special patron of Augustus,[25] and above all the source of the prophecies which have guided the Trojans.[26] Apollo's gaze is on the distant future, on the coming glory of Rome:

3.97 hic domus Aeneae cunctis dominabitur oris
et nati natorum et qui nascentur ab illis,

and he reiterates this theme when he commends the *virtus* of Ascanius (9.642-44), who at that point symbolizes the potential of his race. But symbolic acts are the stuff of tragedy. Ascanius is not yet ready, for he is *ardens* like Nisus (9.652 ~ 198) and unless stopped in his eagerness for battle, he is likely to become another youthful victim like Euryalus, Pallas, or Lausus. Apollo saves Ascanius for the destiny that awaits him.

This emphasis on Ascanius' destiny provides a further point of contact with Book 4 and may explain the allusions to Mercury. While the actions of the two gods differ (Apollo stopping Ascanius, Mercury rousing Aeneas to action), the essential purpose of each intervention is the same. Mercury, finding Aeneas unmoved by the glory of his mission, reminds him of his duty to his son (4.272-76); and deeply shaken he obeys.[27] Ascanius, too easily drawn to glory, must be restrained by Apollo. In this light the verbal reminiscences and structural similarities help focus attention on the principal concern of the two episodes—the future of Ascanius.

We have already observed how the prayer of Ascanius and Jupiter's response follow the pattern of the *augurium maximum* (see above, pp. 144-45). Such an allusion is particularly appropriate here. It provides the necessary rebuttal to the charge of Numanus and singles out Ascanius as a *theios anēr*. In fact, Apollo's epiphany comes as a specific answer to Numanus' *quis deus*, for here the very god who had guided the Trojans appears as if to confirm the validity of his oracles. But the seriousness of the challenge is also emphasized by the repetitions, which recall another

[24] In the *Iliad* Apollo on various occasions checks Diomedes, Patroclus, and Hector (*Il.* 5.436, 16.702-709, 20.375-78). Cf. Kühn (1971: 131).

[25] Both these aspects are stressed in the description of the battle of Actium, where Apollo's bow puts the opponents of Augustus to flight (8.704-706). See also Binder (1971: 250-55).

[26] The Penates are sent by Apollo (3.154-55), Celaeno derives her prophetic skill from him (3.251), as do Helenus (3.474) and the Sibyl (6.35).

[27] That it was this aspect of Mercury's appeal which moved him is clear from what he later says to Dido (4.354-55).

instance when Aeneas' mission was so severely threatened that Jupiter himself had to intervene.[28] By evoking the earlier pattern these lines suggest a closer connection between Apollo and Jupiter—the ultimate source of the prophecies, so that the epiphany becomes linked and subordinated to the omen of Jupiter. All these associations with other important scenes in the *Aeneid* converging in the *aristeia* of Ascanius are clearly not the result of careless composition, for they effectively articulate the worthiness of Ascanius to inherit his father's role. The reminiscences place him squarely within the patriarchal tradition, but he also embodies all the brightest hopes, as in his brief moment of glory he spans the gulf between the Trojan past and the Roman future.

7. *Venus, Anchises, and Creusa*

Most of the repetitions examined so far have dealt with the public role of Aeneas and the destiny of his race. Several others occur when he meets with Venus, Anchises, and Creusa, which show the private man struggling under the burden of his mission. When Venus appears to Aeneas at Carthage in the guise of a Spartan maiden, he recognizes her only as she hurries away, and frustrated by such deception he exclaims:

1.407 quid natum totiens, crudelis tu quoque, falsis
ludis imaginibus? cur dextrae *iungere dextram*
non *datur* ac ver*as audire et reddere voces*?[29]

It is a frustration Aeneas has to live with for the rest of the poem. He cannot grasp things securely, nor can he see them undisguised so as to dispel all doubt. His destiny has been revealed to him in segments that do not quite form a complete picture. The significance of what Vulcan has wrought on his shield eludes him when he shoulders it,—as he did Anchises in Book 2: it is largely an act of faith and an acceptance of duty. Even his descent to the underworld to see his father proves disappointing despite the revelations about the future.[30]

[28] One might add that Dido, like Numanus, is unwilling to believe Aeneas' claim to divine guidance of his actions (cf. 4.377-80).

[29] Cf. Catull. 64.166: nec miss*as audire* queunt nec *reddere voces*.

[30] Since Heinze (1915: 271-80) it has generally been assumed that Aeneas gradually develops a deeper understanding of his mission and greater self-control and confidence in carrying it out (see also Oppermann 1938: 47-71; Büchner 1955: 1360, 1390; Otis 1964: 223, 295-312). The notion of such character development has been questioned by Pöschl (1977: 82-83) and Burck (1958: 137-38). W. R. Johnson (1976: 75-84, 113-14, 127-28) rightly emphasizes the ambiguities of the poem, where images are often blurred and characters placed in circumstances they cannot comprehend. Thus Turnus' ignorance differs from that of Aeneas only in degree, for "essentially both men move in a world where appearances are not only deceptive but also potentially fatal and where...the flux of perceptions...is never finally caught up into a pattern that is at once intelligible and trustworthy" (p. 114).

Aeneas is greeted with words recalling what he had earlier said to Venus:

6.688 vicit iter durum pietas? *datur* ora tueri,
nate, tua et not*as audire et reddere voces*?

The reminiscence suggests that the present is going to be a reversal of the past, and eager to clasp his father to his breast he replies with a further echo from the Venus scene:

6.697 *da iungere dextram*,
da, genitor, TEQUE AmPlExU NE SUBTRAHE NOSTRO.

But the last line also recalls the more recent meeting with Dido, which stands out as a painful reminder of his inability to convey the agony of his inner struggle. It was his last desperate plea to her for understanding:

6.465 siste gradum TEQUE AsPEctU NE SUBTRAHE NOSTRO.
QUEM FUGIS? extremum fato quod te adloquor hoc est.

But Dido remained unmoved; and Aeneas shattered and weeping went on the road before him. Now standing before Anchises he longs for the embrace that might somehow heal the isolation his mission had imposed on him, or at least dispel the uncertainty:

6.699 sic memorans largo fletu simul ora rigabat.
ter conatus ibi collo dare bracchia circum;
ter frustra comprensa manus effugit imago,
par levibus ventis volucrique simillima somno.

The whole scene with Anchises is framed by this empty embrace and the departure through the gate of false dreams. Frustration has by now become a theme,[31] for we may recall how in Book 5 Anchises, after the necessary instructions, disappears into thin air before Aeneas can reply:

5.738 '*iamque vale*; torquet medios Nox umida cursus
et me saevus equis Oriens adflavit anhelis.'
*dixer*at Et *tEnUIs* fug*it* ceu fumus *in auras.*
Aeneas 'quo deinde ruis? quo proripis?' inquit,
'QUEM FUGIS? aut quis te nostris complexibus arcet?'

Both scenes are linked through repetition to the epiphany of Creusa:

2.789 '*iamque vale* et nati serva communis amorem.'
haec ubi dicta dedit, lacrimantem et multa volentem
dicere dEsErU*It*, *tenuis*que recessit *in auras.*
ter conatus ibi collo dare bracchia circum;

[31] Cf. Boyle (1972: 75-76, 119-23).

ter frustra comprensa manus effugit imago,
par levibus ventis volucrique simillima somno.[32]

Aeneas' frustrated embrace of Anchises is modeled on the meeting between Odysseus and Anticleia in *Od.* 11,[33] but there is no Homeric precedent for the Creusa scene. While it is natural for Aeneas to want to embrace Creusa after having searched madly for her amid the ruins of burning Troy, we should keep in mind that she is the first to give him specific information about his destiny,[34] so that his reaction is also prompted by what she has revealed. Rather than being a gesture of clinging to the past, as has been proposed,[35] it seems to be an attempt to affirm the reality of the moment. Creusa foretells a strange destiny, but is it really Creusa, or just a mirage, a figment of a mind deranged by the loss of all that was dear? She leaves with much unsaid and unanswered (*multa volentem/ dicere deseruit*, 2.790-91),[36] and the vain embrace provides a strange counterpoint to her revelation.

8. *Neoptolemus*

Putnam has rightly emphasized the significance of the structural and verbal echoes between the fall of Troy and Aeneas' attack on the city of Latinus.[37] Particularly interesting are the parallels with Neoptolemus, whom we had first encountered before the palace of Priam smashing his way through the gate with an axe:

[32] There is also some similarity with the Orpheus-Eurydice episode in *G* 4.497-502:

'*iamque vale*: feror ingenti circumdata nocte
invalidasque tibi tendens, heu non tua, palmas.'
dixit *et* ex oculis subito, *ceu fumus in auras*
commixtus tenuis, fugit diversa, neque illum
prensantem nequiquam umbras *et multa volentem*
dicere praeterea vidit.

Putnam (1965: 41-47) cites many parallels, and suggests that Orpheus' loss of Eurydice may have served as a model for Aeneas' loss of Creusa in their flight from Troy. In the Ennian tradition Creusa is known as *Eurydica* (cf. *Ann.* 37).

[33] Cf. *Od.* 11.206-208. The parallel is already cited by Macrobius, *Sat.* 5.7.8. For a good discussion of how this scene is transformed in *Aen.* 6 see Knauer (1964: 123-29).

[34] Hector had made only vague reference to a city Aeneas was to found (2.294-95). Creusa, on the other hand, mentions Hesperia (781), Tiber (782), and a *regia coniunx* (783).

[35] Putnam (1965: 45-47) sees in Aeneas' attempt to embrace Creusa a desire to hold on to the past, and he feels that the experience makes him realize "that the clock cannot be turned back". This is an attractive interpretation, but because the same gesture occurs in the scene with Anchises in Book 6, it seems unlikely that Aeneas had come to such a realization by the end of Book 2. For Segal (1974: 34-42) the echoes stress the contrast between the two scenes.

[36] Highet (1972: 226-27) believes that the phrase is meant to recall Aeneas' loss of Creusa (2.790-91) and Orpheus' loss of Eurydice (*G* 4.500-502).

[37] Putnam (1965: 172-77).

2.479 *ipse inter primos* correpta dura bipenni
limina perrumpit postisque a cardine vellit
aeratos.

There is a glimpse of the terror gripping those inside:[38]

2.486 at domus interior gemitu miseroque tumultu
miscetur, penitusque cavae *plangoribus aedes*
femineis ululant,

and then the Greeks rush in—nothing can stop them:

2.494 fit via vi; rumpunt aditus *primosque trucidant*
immissi Danai et late loca milite complent.

In Book 12 the situation is repeated, but the roles are reversed, for this time, instead of being a passive observer, Aeneas is the attacker. Venus has roused in him the desire to storm Lavinium and raze it to the ground (*eruam et aequa solo fumantia culmina ponam*, 12.569). The attack is swift and devastating:

12.576 scalae improviso subitusque apparuit ignis.
discurrunt alii ad portas *primosque trucidant*,
ferrum alii torquent et obumbrant aethera telis.
ipse inter primos dextram sub moenia tendit
Aeneas, magnaque incusat voce Latinum
testaturque deos iterum se ad proelia cogi,
bis iam Italos hostis, haec altera foedera rumpi.

At this point Amata, despairing of her cause, commits suicide and adds further grief and confusion to the beleaguered city:

12.607 resonant late *plangoribus aedes*.

An association between Aeneas and Neoptolemus is not unexpected, for in the latter part of the poem Aeneas is largely modeled on the Iliadic Achilles.[39] Putnam takes these references to Neoptolemus as an indication that Aeneas is being corrupted by *furor*: "Turnus is more than ever the pitiful victim as Aeneas gives evidence of succumbing to the rage which he had up to now denied."[40] But the parallel should not be pushed too far, for

[38] See Raabe (1974: 124-25).

[39] Turnus, who fancies himself another Achilles, is singled out in the catalogue as

7.783 *ipse inter primos* praestanti corpore Turnus,

and so is Aeneas when he departs from Pallanteum:

8.586 Aeneas *inter primos* et fidus Achates.

The phrase *ipse inter primos* thus appears to be confined to Neoptolemus, Aeneas, and Turnus, all of whom are at one time or another cast in the role of *alius Achilles*. Cf. Putnam (1965: 175), Nethercut (1971-72: 128 n21), Boyle (1972: 66-70, 130-33, 140-43).

[40] Putnam (1965: 173).

neither can Turnus be equated with helpless Polites, nor is Aeneas' attack motivated by the same kind of *furor* as that of Pyrrhus. On the contrary, Aeneas calls upon the gods to witness that it is a treaty twice broken which forces him to fight (12.579-82). The echoes therefore suggest that this not a parallel, but a reversal of the situation in Book 2. Not only are the Trojans, once beleaguered and defeated, now cast as the victorious attackers, but in contrast with Neoptolemus' savage onslaught, Aeneas is or thinks he is waging a *iustum bellum.*

Yet Aeneas' conduct in the war is not above reproach. Deranged by the death of Pallas, he blazes a path of wanton destruction, killing priests and suppliants, and meeting no worthy opponent until he comes upon Mezentius. Only when Lausus gives his life to save his father does Aeneas come to his senses (10.821-24). His noble eulogy over fallen Lausus (10.825-30) is often contrasted with what Turnus says over Pallas (10.491-95), but we should not forget the brutal boast Aeneas had uttered after decapitating Tarquitus (10.557-60).[41] Turnus at least restored Pallas' body for burial; Aeneas leaves Tarquitus to rot.

This is not a case of justified *furor*, as Bowra would have us believe.[42] Much of the episode is based on *Iliad* 21, where Achilles relentlessly slaughters the Trojans, but Aeneas' conduct, when compared with his past *pietas* and his role as champion of order and justice, seems much more shocking and brutal than that of Achilles. Like Achilles, he captures eight youths to sacrifice at the funeral of Pallas, but then he also kills a priest of Apollo (*Phoebi Triviaeque sacerdos*, 10.537) adorned with the sacred fillet of the very god who had guided the Trojans to Italy.[43] Twice the plea of a

[41] This is modeled on what Achilles says after killing Lycaon (*Il.* 21.122-35), but Homeric imitation does not suffice to explain Aeneas' behavior. His rage is emphasized repeatedly: *ardens* (514), *furit* (545), *ardenti* (552), and it all culminates in the image of Aeneas as hundred-armed Aegaeon fighting against the lightning bolts of Jove (10.565-70). The man of *pietas* has become identified with the enemy of Jove, as if to illustrate how the intensity of Aeneas' grief and anger has distorted his perception of his role. Cf. Hornsby (1970: 108-109).

[42] Bowra (1933-34: 16-20) believes that Vergil, rather than following the orthodox Stoic view of anger, adopted the more moderate view of the Augustan circle: "Augustus himself boasted that he had revenged himself on the murderers of Julius, and where there was revenge there was anger. So we find anger treated as a legitimate passion by the poets and historians of Rome" (p. 16). But such reasoning is fallacious. The identification between Aeneas and Augustus does not imply that Vergil was ready to condone Aeneas' brutality just because Augustus had also been brutal, while the attitudes of other Augustan poets and historians need not coincide with Vergil's own. Kühn (1957: 49-50) likewise feels that the references to Aeneas as *saevus* (e.g. 12.107, 888, 910) express justified anger that contrasts with Turnus' uncontrolled rage. See also Raabe (1974: 126-31). It suffices to say that in Book 10 his anger is largely misdirected.

[43] The description recalls both the Sibyl—*Phoebi Triviaeque sacerdos* (6.35) and Apollo's priest Anius—*Phoebique sacerdos, vitt*is et *sacra redimit*us *tempora* lauro (3.80-81; cf. 10.538:

suppliant (Magus in 10.524-29, Liger in 10.597-98) fails to check Aeneas' murderous impulse.[44]

In describing the death of Magus,

10.535 sic fatus gale*am* *laeva* tenet atque reflexa
cervice orantis *capulo tenus* applica*t* *ensem*,

Vergil must have thought of the death of Lycaon in *Il.* 21.114-18:

ὣς φάτο, τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ λύτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ·
ἔγχος μέν ῥ' ἀφέηκεν, ὁ δ' ἕζετο χεῖρε πετάσσας
ἀμφοτέρας· 'Αχιλεὺς δὲ ἐρυσσάμενος ξίφος ὀξὺ
τύψε κατὰ κληῗδα παρ' αὐχένα, πᾶν δέ οἱ εἴσω
δῦ ξίφος ἄμφηκες.

But there is also a verbal parallel in the description of how Neoptolemus kills Priam:

2.552 implicuitque com*am* *laeva*, dextraque coruscum
extulit ac lateri *capulo tenus* abdidi*t* *ensem.*

This echo of Neoptolemus' sacrilegious butchery helps stress a fundamental difference between the Lycaon and Magus scenes. Achilles speaks to Lycaon almost compassionately, calling him *philos*, as he tries to explain why he must die. Lycaon understands. Both recognize death as life's common denominator, and transcending success and failure they embrace the paradoxical insignificance of the moment.[45] Aeneas is cold and curt in his reply to Magus, and evidently forgetting the solemn injunction of Anchises (*parcere subiectis et debellare superbos*, 6.853) he plunges the sword home to the hilt—*capulo tenus*—in a gesture of savage rage.[46] Lacking the clarity of vision and the humanity that had characterized Achilles even in his most violent moments, Aeneas appears in Book 10 much more like the degenerate Achilles—Neoptolemus.

infula cui *sacra redimi*bat *tempora vitt*a). The verbal similarity is striking, though possibly formulaic. More puzzling is the fact that Vergil should have chosen this particular priest to be the victim of Aeneas' rage, to be sacrificed (*immolat*, 10.541!) not unlike Priam or Laocoon.

[44] Aeneas' rejection of ransom (*belli commercia*, 10.532) may also call to mind the noble words of Pyrrhus of Epirus in Ennius *Ann.* 194-96. But whereas Pyrrhus returns the captives without ransom, Aeneas kills Magus. For a more positive interpretation see Raabe (1974: 152).

[45] Cf. Whitman (1958: 207-18).

[46] The phrase *capulo tenus* occurs only in these two passages of the *Aeneid.* Homer's description—πᾶν δέ οἱ εἴσω δῦ ξίφος—has an air of impersonality, emphasizing the action of the sword rather than the thrusting motion of Achilles.

B. *Dido*

The Dido episode is very rich in associations, for it is linked with the rest of the *Aeneid* through numerous repetitions, and it provides structural and thematic patterns for many later scenes. This is not surprising. Aeneas' involvement with Dido is not just another stop on his way to Italy, like Jason's stay with Hypsipyle or even Odysseus' with Circe. She is Aeneas' main antagonist, because she alone seems to offer an alternative to the laborious quest for a new home.[47] The prospect of finding peace and personal fulfilment in the love of this remarkable woman tests his commitment to his public duty much more than all the hardships of his voyage or the bloodshed in Italy.[48] Thus it is perhaps the crucial episode in the entire poem, and one whose outcome affects not only Aeneas himself, but also the events that follow.[49]

Even before the *novae artes* of Venus a basis for attraction between Dido and Aeneas is suggested by the similarity of their backgrounds and virtues—the loss of their spouses, the flight from their ancestral homes, the dutiful performance of their roles as leaders of their peoples, their remarkable piety, and their surpassing beauty. The Diana and Apollo similes (1.498-502, 4.143-49) further emphasize this affinity.[50] Past experiences, as well as present needs and aspirations engender sympathy and love, which with divine manipulation lead to an ill-starred union that seals the future enmity of Rome and Carthage. From this union Aeneas does not emerge altogether blameless, for Dido's repeated allusions to his faithlessness and broken promises[51] imply that either there was some com-

[47] To Boyle (1972: 78) Dido symbolizes the private world and individual values exploited and extinguished by the demands of empire and fame.

[48] Those who find Dido's character fundamentally flawed and her tragedy the result of misunderstanding and self-deception (e.g. Quinn 1963: 29-58) lessen the magnitude of this challenge to Aeneas' commitment. I prefer the interpretation of Rudd (1976: 32-53), who sees that Dido had both private and public reasons for pursuing her liaison with Aeneas. The conflict is thus more than simply a matter of love and duty. "On the one side was her love for Sychaeus, her duty to his memory, and the force of the oath which she had sworn. On the other her love for Aeneas, her desire for children, and her hopes for the future of her people" (p. 48). But cf. G. Williams (1968: 383-85).

[49] Cf. Perret (1952: 106-107), who sees the Carthaginian episode rather as a symbol of the Punic Wars and of the tests that had to be overcome in Rome's rise to power.

[50] See Pöschl (1977: 85-93) and Austin on 1.498ff.

[51] Aeneas' hesitation to tell Dido about his plans to depart suggests that his conduct had led her to have very different expectations (cf. 4.292). From that point on the theme of faithlessness and broken promises (ironically the very accusations Romans had traditionally leveled against the Carthaginians) dominates everything Dido says: *perfide* (305), *data dextera quondam* (307), *per...dextramque tuam...per conubia nostra, per inceptos hymenaeos* (314-16), *perfide* (366), *nusquam tuta fides* (373), *non iam coniugium antiquum, quod prodidit, oro* (431), *Laomedonteae sentis periuria gentis?* (542), *en dextra fidesque* (597). Admittedly these are stock themes of elegiac

mitment, or Aeneas conveniently allowed her to think that there was. Betrayed in her fondest hopes Dido vowed to haunt his memory forever—*omnibus umbra locis adero* (4.386), and her curse condemns Aeneas and the Trojans to war, suffering, and death:

4.612 si tangere portus
infandum caput ac terris adnare necesse est,
et sic fata Iovis poscunt, hic terminus haeret,
at bello audacis populi vexatus et armis,
finibus extorris, complexu avulsus Iuli
auxilium imploret videatque indigna suorum
funera; nec, cum se sub leges pacis iniquae
tradiderit, regno aut optata luce fruatur,
sed cadat ante diem mediaque inhumatus harena.

In the second half of the *Aeneid* these things come to pass: war, separation from Iulus in quest for aid, horrible slaughter of Trojans and allies, and finally a peace on Juno' terms. Furthermore, Servius cites a tradition according to which Aeneas died prematurely and without a burial.[52] A connection between Dido's curse and the war in Italy is already suggested by the very fact that she had prayed to Juno and the *Dirae ultrices* (4.608-610) to accomplish her revenge, and that in Book 7 it is none other than Juno and the fury Allecto, *dirarum ab sede dearum* (7.324),[53] who incite the Latins to war against Aeneas. Such a link between the curse and later hardships is also supported by the Homeric parallel—the curse of Polyphemus (*Od.* 9.528-35, already noted by Macrobius, *Sat.* 5.12.5-6), who prays to Poseidon that Odysseus may lose his companions, his ship, and find trouble on his return to Ithaca. Poseidon hears him, and it is clear that his subsequent wrath at Odysseus is motivated directly by the blinding of Polyphemus.[54]

poetry, but that should not induce us to make light of what she says, for unlike the heroines of the amatory tradition, Dido is not melodramatic but tragic.

[52] See Servius on 4.620: *alii dicunt quod victor Aeneas cum sacrificaret super Numicum fluvium lapsus est, et eius nec cadaver inventum est: unde dicit 'mediaque inhumatus harena'.* Cf. also Diodor. 7.3.2; Livy 1.2.6; Dionys. 1.64.4-5; also see Highet (1972: 178-79). On the other hand, Koch (1967: 119-26) suggests that the curse actually foreshadows Dido's own death and the future defeat of Carthage. One should consider, however, that *mediaque inhumatus harena* evokes (if anything) rather the death of Priam (*iacet ingens litore truncus,/ avulsumque umeris caput et sine nomine corpus*, 2.557-58).

[53] Allecto is snake-haired like the Furies (*unum de crinibus anguem*, 7.346), she has *furialia membra* (7.415), and she is called *Erinys* (7.447, 570).

[54] Homer is careful to mention that Poseidon hears the prayer, and later he has Teiresias reiterate the cause of Poseidon's anger by quoting the exact words of Polyphemus (*Od.* 11.114-15 = 9.534-35); Vergil dispenses with such epic detail, sketching the scene with a few bold strokes and relying on the reader's recollection of the Homeric model to supply the rest. Thus nothing is said about the accomplishment of the curse, for the allusion to the

Vergil, of course, does not perceive the process of causation in Homer's relatively simple terms. Juno's anger has many sources, but ultimately it derives from a fundamental conflict with Jupiter. Such a schism between the spheres of power embodied by Jupiter and Juno[55] is alien to the comparatively monolithic Olympus of the *Odyssey* and the petty rivalries of the *Iliad.* Vergil sees historical events as part of a continuing interaction of these metaphysical forces in all their manifestations. Dido and Aeneas embody this conflict on the human level, and here the significance of the Dido episode for Aeneas is the same as that of the Cyclops episode for Odysseus.[56] Because in the *Aeneid,* however, the human and divine spheres are very much interrelated, Dido's curse takes on cosmic dimensions, and its fulfilment runs parallel with the working out of Juno's anger.

This superhuman aspect of Dido's hatred reveals itself when Aeneas meets her in the underworld. Hoping to gain forgiveness and under-

---

Homeric scene suggests that it will be accomplished no less than the curse of Polyphemus. Vergil uses the same technique in *Aen.* 11, where the effect of the Latin matrons' prayer to Minerva is left to be deduced from *Iliad* 6. For examples of similar techniques in Roman poetry see G. Williams (1968: 250-357; 1980: 20-44 and *passim*).

55 Aeschylus' *Oresteia* may have provided a pattern for the divine schism, and particularly for the conversion of Juno, who yields to Jupiter's *nec gens ulla tuos aeque celebrabit honores* (12.840) just as the Furies had yielded to similar promises by Athena (*Eum.* 804-807, 833-36, 851-57, 890-91). Because in Vergil's *Aeneid* fate appears to be a dynamic process rather than a fixed plan, I cannot share the orthodox view which tends to equate fate with Jupiter's will (see Heinze 1915: 293-97; Bailey 1935: 220-32; Oppermann 1938: 68-69; Knight 1944b: 320; Büchner 1946: 6-7, 17, 20-27, though more cautious in 1955: 1457-58, 1460-62; Wlosok 1967: 30 n22). Others have seen Jupiter and the gods primarily as executors and instruments (e.g. Sellar 1897: 337-38; MacInnes 1910: 170; Matthaei 1917: 11-26; Carlsson 1945: 112; Perret 1952: 131). Boyancé (1963: 39-57) carefully steers between the two extremes, while Tracy (1964: 188-95), though leaning towards the latter, finds Jupiter's implementation of fate's decrees neither consistent nor effective. More in accord with my own view is the recent work of Pötscher (1977, 1978), who suggests that Vergil's ideas about the workings of fate are indebted to Roman political and juridical practice, which sought to arrive at a *consensus*, a synthesis of opposing viewpoints: "Was in der Aeneis als Kampf der Interessen der Götter — in den *fata Iovis* in gewissem Sinne schon zusammen gefasst — erscheint, ist nichts anderes als die dynamische Einheit des Willens der Gottheit, der wie in einem Kräfteparallelogramm als Resultante von im einzelnen divergierenden Wünschen der einzelnen Götter zustandekommt" (1977: 157; see also 1978: 409-14). For other recent attempts to elucidate Vergil's concept of fate see Kühn (1971); Ruch (1971: 218-21); Liebermann (1976: 173-207).

56 The war in Italy had been predicted already before the Dido episode by Jupiter (1.263), Helenus (3.458), the omen at *Castrum Minervae* (3.539-40), and after it by the Sibyl (6.86) and Anchises (6.890). But Jupiter and Helenus completely ignore the causes of the events they foretell. Only the Sibyl explains that the war will be brought about by another *hospita coniunx* (6.93). She describes it as a repetition of the Trojan War, but her words also vaguely recall Dido's curse (cf. 6.91-92 and 4.617), while *causa mali tanti* may remind one of *ille dies ... primusque malorum/ causa fuit* (4.169-70). Consequently none of the prophecies contradict the above interpretation of the Dido episode.

standing, he tries to explain why he could not have stayed at Carthage, and begs her to listen as a last favor to him:

6.466 *quem fugis? extremum* fato quod te adloquor *hoc* est.

It is a pitiful echo and an ironic inversion of Dido's earlier plea:

4.429 *quo ruit? extremum hoc* miserae det munus amanti:

4.435 *extremam hanc* oro veniam.

But now she remains unmoved:

6.469 *illa solo fixos oculos aversa tenebat*
nec magis incepto vultum sermone movetur
quam si dura silex aut stet Marpesia cautes.[57]

Her response is like that of Athena in the mural on Juno's temple refusing the supplication of the Trojan women:

1.479 interea ad templum non aequae Palladis ibant
crinibus Iliades passis peplumque ferebant
suppliciter, tristes et tunsae pectora palmis;
diva solo fixos oculos aversa tenebat.

While the scene in Book 6 is largely based on the meeting between Odysseus and Ajax in *Od.* 11.541-64, the language evokes the Iliadic scene depicted on the temple and suggests that Aeneas, like the Trojan women whose prayers failed to thwart their city's fall, will not escape his lot. The repeated line stresses the nature and scope of Dido's wrath and aptly characterizes Aeneas' position. Like a suppliant he tries to appease and explain, but Dido is implacable. Her pain, her anger, and her hatred are too vast. They transcend human bounds to the point where they merge with the archetypal wrath of Juno, and where Dido, like Euripides' Medea, becomes the incarnation of her vengeance.

It is generally agreed that the *Iliad* provides the primary model for the Italian War, but as we shall see, the Dido episode functions as an important secondary pattern. When Juno intervenes in Latium, her attack is twofold. She confronts Aeneas with a repetition of the Trojan War, but events leading up to the war constitute an inversion of his experiences at Carthage. The juxtaposition of these two patterns lends further support to the view that Dido's curse parallels and implements the wrath of Juno. The significance of the Dido episode for the events in Italy is brought out

---

57 Knauer (1964: 111) points out that 6.469 continues the inversion of the earlier scene in which Aeneas had remained unmoved by Dido's pleas (4.331-32); cf. also Hornsby (1970: 98-99) and Austin (on 6.469), who remarks on the odd coincidence of grammatical rime in both 6.468-69 and 4.331-32 (q.v., also on 4.55).

through verbal echoes, as well as thematic and structural parallels, which suggest that past patterns are being repeated or inverted.

A hint of that may already be observed in the invocation at the beginning of Book 7:

7.37 *nunc age*, qui reges, *Erato*, quae tempora, rerum
quis Latio antiquo fuerit status,

which is derived from Apollonius:

Arg. 3.1 Εἰ δ' ἄγε νῦν Ἐρατώ, παρ' ἔμ' ἵστασο καί μοι ἔνισπε.

There has been some reluctance to assign meaning to the invocation of this particular Muse, both because the notion of each Muse presiding over her proper artistic sphere seems late (cf. Ath. 13. 555a-b, Plut. *Mor.* 746 e-f, Diodor. 4.7.3-4) and because Servius (on 7.37) expressly states: *sane Erato vel pro Calliope, vel pro qualicumque musa posuit.* Erato may not yet have been perceived as the Muse of love poetry, but her name suggested love (cf. Plato, *Phdr.* 259c) and Ovid repeatedly invokes her in that context (*A.A.* 2.16: *nunc Erato, nam tu nomen Amoris habes.* Cf. *Fast.* 4.195-96). Apollonius himself alludes to the name's etymology (*Arg.* 3.5: τῶ καί τοι ἐπήρατον οὔνομ' ἀνῆπται), which explains why he calls on Erato to tell of Medea's love.[58] Vergil could not have missed the connection, and all we know about his art makes it unlikely that after observing what Apollonius had done he would have used Erato *pro qualicumque musa.* What leads us to doubt Erato's amatory associations in the *Aeneid* is that the invocation is followed immediately by the mention of *horrida bella* (7.41). Not a word about love. Yet this tension between Apollonian Muse and Iliadic subject matter may be intentional, for *Aeneid* 7 combines both Homeric[59] and Apollonian elements. Jason's arrival in Colchis, the activity of Eros, and the passion of Medea provide patterns not only for several scenes in *Aeneid* 1 and 4, but also for the embassy of Ilioneus to Latinus and the intervention of Allecto.[60] The third book of the *Argonautica* thus undergoes a double

[58] Athenaeus (13.555a-b) begins his discussion of love by quoting Apollonius' invocation (*Arg.* 3.1), which tells us how the passage was understood in his time. The strongest case for associating Erato with an amatory context is made by Todd (1931). See also Knauer (1964: 227-28); Bömer on Ovid *Fast.* 4.195; Conington and Fordyce on 7.37. Adherents of Servius' interpretation include Heyne, T. E. Page, Klingner (1967: 497), and recently Basson (1975: 95-116). Cf. also Escher, 'Erato' *RE* 6 (1909) 354-55 and Kees, 'Musai' *RE* 16 (1933) 724-30.

[59] For a discussion of the Homeric patterns see Knauer (1964: 226-39).

[60] The consultations of Hera with Athena (*Arg.* 3.6-35) and with Kypris (*Arg.* 3.36-110) serve as the model for the Juno-Venus scene (*A* 4.90-128). The Kypris-Eros scene (*Arg.* 3.111-166) is imitated in the Venus-Amor scene (*A* 1.657-690) and the Juno-Allecto scene (*A* 7.323-340). Venus wraps Aeneas in a cloud (*A* 1.411-414) just as Hera does Jason

transformation—first in the Dido episode and then again in Book 7. But while in the latter the invocation heralds a return of the Apollonian pattern, the tension between Erato and her theme suggests that it is actually a reversal of that pattern. The Apollonian love motif, which had provided the model for Dido's passion, has now become perverted to express hatred and revenge.

This becomes more apparent as the book progresses. The invocation to Erato is followed by a brief account of Latinus' predicament, and then the focus shifts to the Trojans. The tables omen, indicating the end of their journey, is confirmed by Jupiter, and they turn to joyous feasting:

7.146 certatim instaurant *epulas* atque omine magno
crateras laeti *statuunt et vina coronant.*

We may recall a similar line in the description of Dido's banquet:

1.723 postquam prima quies *epulis* mensaeque remotae,
crateras magnos *statuunt et vina coronant.*

The festivities at Dido's palace continue through the night, during which she learns about the fall of Troy and the wanderings of Aeneas (Books 2 and 3). But in the course of Aeneas' long tale Dido, through Cupid's insidious influence, changes from an exemplary ruler to a distraught and lovesick woman, not unlike Calypso or Medea. By the time dawn appears at the beginning of Book 4:

4.6 *postera* Phoebea *lustrabat lampade terras*,

her passions are fully aroused, and the once happy scene is shrouded in gloom. In Book 7 a similar dawn follows the Trojan celebration of their arrival in Italy:

7.148 *postera* cum prima *lustrabat lampade terras*
orta dies.

Here, just as in Book 4, the dawn marks a change.[61] As so often in the

(*Arg.* 3.211). Jason marvels at the palace of Aeetes and at the works of Hephaestus (*Arg.* 3.215-274) just as Aeneas marvels at the temple of Juno and the pictures of the Trojan War (*A* 1.441-493), but the motif recurs in Book 7, where the Trojan emissaries behold the temple and palace of Latinus (*A* 7.170-191). The arrow of Eros (*Arg.* 3.275-298) is imitated in the intervention of Allecto (*A* 7.341-358, 445-466), but to a lesser extent the Eros scene is also the model for the Amor scene in Book 1 (*A* 1.712-722). Finally, the scene between Aeetes and the Argonauts (*Arg.* 3.299-438) parallels the Ilioneus-Dido-Aeneas scene (*A* 1.520-636) and the Latinus-Ilioneus scene (*A* 7.191-285).

[61] The function of repeated dawns and nights merits a study of its own, for at times such repetitions seem to articulate thematic and structural parallels. For example, the sunrise accompanying the landing at the Tiber,

7.25 *iamque rubescebat* radiis mare et aethere ab alto
Aurora in roseis fulgebat lutea bigis,

Aeneid, the joy is short-lived and the hope for peace, for an end to toil and suffering is frustrated. Dido's banquet, like the jubilation at the entry of the Wooden Horse into Troy, had only managed to conceal behind a festive facade the dark forces lurking within. The rejoicing is premature. The new day will witness not just the favorable reception of Latinus, but Allecto's intervention and Amata's frenzy as well.

1. *Latinus*

The structural and verbal parallels between Books 1 and 7 are well known,[62] and it is generally agreed that the repetition of the structural patterns is deliberate, although that has been variously interpreted. Buchheit believes that the landing at the mouth of the Tiber and the embassy to Latinus are to be contrasted with the landing at Carthage and Ilioneus' plea before Dido.[63] To be sure, the description of the Carthaginian harbor contains ominous overtones missing in the later scene, because Vergil presumably wished to contrast the false with the true destination of Aeneas.[64] I wonder, however, if the Latinus-Ilioneus scene deserves quite

---

recalls the time when Italy was first sighted:

3.521 *iamque rubescebat* stell*is Aurora* fugatis
cum procul obscuros collis humilemque videmus
Italiam.

In the manner of ring-composition the final arrival in Italy balances its first appearance. Likewise, the apparition of the Penates prophesying Italy as Aeneas' new home is balanced by the vision of Tiber confirming that prophecy, and the two scenes are further linked by the similarly described nights:

3.147 *nox erat et terris animalia* somnus *habebat*

8.26 *nox erat et terras animalia* fessa per omnis
alituum pecudumque genus *so*por alt*us habebat.*

In Book 4 Dido's desire to hear the tale of Aeneas again and again on successive nights is nicely reinforced by an echo of Aeneas' words from the beginning of his tale—*suadentque cadentia sidera somnos* (4.81 = 2.9). This repetition recreates the mood of that night and dramatizes how Dido's growing passion has trapped her in a Sisyphean cycle. Knauer has noted how Vergil's imitations of Homeric dawns and nights seem to function as *Leitzitate* pointing out which particular Homeric scene is being imitated (cf. 1964: 154, 249 n1, 253-54, 260-63, 266-67, 338). If dawns and nights can stress structural parallels between Homer and the *Aeneid*, then presumably they could do so within the *Aeneid* itself.

[62] See Fraenkel (1945: 1-4), Pöschl (1977: 24-33), Duckworth (1954: 12), Buchheit (1963: 71-77, 173-89), Otis (1964: 320-23, 327-28), Reckford (1961: 262-69), Putnam (1970: 408-30), Conway on 1.647.

[63] Buchheit (1963: 173-89); see also Knauer (1964: 230, 239).

[64] The description of the Phorkys harbor in *Od.* 13.96-104 has traditionally been regarded as Vergil's literary source (so Conington on 1.159), but the other Homeric harbors are also relevant here (see Conway and Austin on 1.159). G. Williams (1968: 637-44) examines how Vergil has combined details from the other harbors within the pattern of the Phorkys harbor to create a unified scene with no one Homeric passage as its direct model. Yet the implica-

so optimistic an interpretation, because a similar beginning leads us to expect a similar outcome. Both Dido and Latinus are lavish in their hospitality, both acknowledge Troy's past greatness (7.195-96, 205 and 1.617-26), and both express the wish to meet Aeneas (cf. 7.263, 1.575). As before with Dido, everything is too good to be true. It seems as if this might at last be the end of the long quest and of all the suffering. But the Sibyl had foretold *bella, horrida bella* (6.86), a theme that is picked up again in the invocation of Erato (dicam *horrida bella*, 7.41). The friendly reception of Latinus, his benevolence, and his willingness to submit to fate and divine will are merely a calm before the storm.

In Book 1 there are several hints of Dido's impending transformation from a civilized, enlightened queen to a frenzied Maenad. The mood is set by the approach of night and by the *novae artes* of Venus, but the tragedy of Dido is also anticipated by the gifts she receives from Aeneas:

1.647 *munera praeterea* ILIACIS EREPTA RUINIS
ferre iubet, PALLAM signis auroque rigentem
et circumtextum croceo VELAMEN acantho,
ornatus Argivae Helenae, quos illa Mycenis,
Pergama cum peteret inconcessosque hymenaeos,
extulerat, matris Ledae mirabile donum;
praeterea *sceptrum*, Ilione quod *ges*serat olim,
maxima natarum *Priami*, colloque monile
bacatum, et duplicem gemmis auroque CORONAM.

She inherits not only the gifts, but also the destinies of Helen and Ilione. Like Helen she seeks *inconcessos hymenaeos* only to cause her own and her city's ruin, and like Ilione she will respond to rejection by suicide.[65] But Latinus also receives gifts:

7.243 dat tibi *praeterea* fortunae parva prioris
munera, reliquias TROIA EX ARDENTE RECEPTAS.
hoc pater Anchises auro libabat ad aras,
hoc *Priami gest*amen erat cum iura vocatis
more daret populis, *sceptrum*que sacerque TIARAS
Iliadumque labor VESTES.

---

tions of what Williams has observed may also support the sense of foreboding Buchheit finds in the language describing the Carthaginian harbor, for Vergil has fused different Homeric scenes to create a tension between relief and apprehension. The general similarity to the Phorkys harbor would suggest welcome tranquility after the storm, but the other elements derive from Odyssean scenes fraught with danger and death: the Cyclops harbor (*Od.* 9.116-141), the Laestrygonian harbor (*Od.* 10.87-94), the island of Helios (*Od.* 12.317-18), and Scylla (*Od.* 12.73-74, 80). See also Worstbrock (1963: 36-39, 82-84) for other parallels and contrasts between Books 1 and 7.

[65] See Servius on 1.654 (*haec autem uxor Polymestoris fuit, quae post captum Ilium eiecta a viro manu sua interiit*) and Austin on 1.650, 653.

Buchheit dwells on the symbolic implications of passing on such insignia of power: "Latinus und mit ihm das lateinische Volk werden hiermit in erhabener Weise ausgezeichnet als die künftigen Schicksalsträger der Römischen Herrschaft."[66] In view of the conditions Juno later wrests from Jupiter in return for giving up her enmity this is an attractive interpretation, but it tends to neglect the darker overtones. The parallel with the Dido-Ilioneus scene, the correspondence between the *palla*, *velamen*, *sceptrum*, and *corona* given to Dido and the *vestes*, *sceptrum*, and *tiaras* given to Latinus is too close to be overlooked. Vergil combines here both light and darkness, hope and foreboding. The gifts to Latinus symbolize not only the transmission of Troy's grandeur and power, but also of her suffering and agony. The reference to Priam does not evoke an image of peace and prosperity, but of defeat and death:

2.557 iacet ingens litore truncus,
avulsumque umeris caput et sine nomine corpus.

Latinus receives both the heritage and the tragic destiny of Priam, and his city, like Troy, will soon be engulfed in a war.[67]

2. *Juno*

The calm of the Latinus scene is broken by Juno, whose activity here parallels her earlier intervention in Book 1. Her hatred for the Trojans and her opposition to fate is revealed each time by means of a storm or its psychological equivalent—madness.[68] But equally relevant is her intervention in Book 4. There she attempted to arrange a marriage between Dido and Aeneas so as to keep him at Carthage, now she hopes to thwart the union of Aeneas and Lavinia. In each case the scene begins with special emphasis on Juno's status as wife of Jupiter (*cara Iovis coniunx*, 4.91 and *saeva Iovis coniunx*, 7.287). Juno's pattern of action is the same as before. Her meeting with Allecto balances the one with Venus. In both scenes

[66] Buchheit (1963: 162 and cf. 171-82, 187-89). This is also the view of Pöschl (1977: 180-181).

[67] This interpretation of the gifts to Latinus has been proposed by Reckford (1961: 265). See also Putnam (1970: 415 n7) and Fenik (1959), who cites many parallels between Priam and Dido which stress the similarity of their respective destinies.

[68] The monologues in both scenes voice similar sentiments (7.304-305 ~ 1.39-40, 7.308 ~ 1.46), and even the instructions to Aeolus and Allecto contain some echoes:

1.69 *incute* vim ventis submersasque obrue puppis,
aut age diversos et *dissice* corpora ponto.

7.338 fecundum con*cute* pectus,
dissice compositam pacem, sere crimina belli.

For a fuller discussion of the two scenes and their symbolic function see Pöschl (1977: 24-33).

the hunt plays a crucial role in accomplishing her plan, but the variation of *cara* to *saeva* suggests a changed purpose and anticipates the transformation of the love theme to vengeful hatred.

We have already seen how the invocation of Erato suggests the continuing importance of the Apollonian pattern which had already been imitated in the Dido episode. The Kypris-Eros scene (*Arg*. 3.111-66), which had provided the model for the Venus-Amor scene (1.657-90), also serves as the model for the Juno-Allecto scene (7.323-40). Like Eros and Amor, Allecto makes no reply to Juno, but silently proceeds to carry out her task. Her encounter with Amata seems again derived from the Apollonian scene (*Arg*. 3.275-98), where Eros shoots the arrow of love at Medea. Here the arrow becomes transformed into the snake Allecto flings at Amata (*conicit*, 7.347 ~ ἧκ', *Arg*. 3.284), which (like the arrow) slips into her inmost heart (7.347 ~ *Arg*. 3.296).

But there is also a direct link between Allecto and the Venus-Amor scene. The effect of the snake on Amata,

7.350 *fall*itque *furentem*
vipere*am inspir*ans animam,

and

7.354 ac dum prima lues udo sublapsa *veneno*
pertemptat sensus *atque ossibus implic*at *ignem*,

contains several echoes from the plan of Venus:

1.659 donis*que furentem*
incendat reginam *atque ossibus implic*et *ignem*,—

and from her instructions to Amor:

1.688 occult*um inspir*es ignem *fall*asque *veneno*.

Allecto's activity parallels that of Amor and recreates the events that had led to Dido's infatuation, though the passion she inspires is not love, but hate.

When Allecto appears before Turnus, the burning venom of the Amata scene metamorphoses into the flaming torch she hurls at him: *FIXit sub pectore* taedas (7.457). This may evoke Dido's love wound,

4.67 tacitum v*ivit sub pectore vulnus*,

which in the end becomes the death wound she deals herself with Aeneas' sword:

4.689 in*FIX*um strid*it sub pectore vulnus*.

The image thus becomes prophetic through its associations, and Dido's

raging passion (*saevit amor*, 4.532) finds here its proper redefinition (*saevit amor ferri*, 7.461).

With Turnus properly enraged, Allecto turns to her crowning act of provocation—*the hunt*. Bent on new wiles (*arte nova*, 7.477 recalling *novas artis*, 1.657), she drives the hounds of Iulus in hot pursuit after the stag of Silvia. This act unleashes the forces of war:

7.481 quae *prima* laborum
causa fuit belloque animos accendit agrestis.

It is an unmistakable allusion to the hunt in Book 4, which likewise was seen as the cause of suffering and death:

4.169 ille dies primus leti *primus*que malorum
causa fuit.

It seems hardly a coincidence that a hunt figures both as the cause of Dido's death and of the war between the Trojans and Italians.[69]

In the Dido episode hunting imagery is closely associated with the love motif.[70] Already the activity of Amor suggests violence. Servius comments on the hostile connotation of *petit* (1.717), while *pectore...haeret* (1.717-18) recurs at the beginning of Book 4 in the description of Dido's love,

4.4 *haerent* inFIXI *pectore vultus*
verbaque,

which then is illustrated by the deer simile:

4.69 qualis coniecta *cerva* sagitta,
quam procul incautam nemora inter Cresia FIXIT
pastor *agens telis* liquitque volatile ferrum
nescius: illa fuga silvas saltusque peragrat
Dictaeos; *haeret* lateri letalis harundo.

[69] Hunting imagery has long been recognized as an important motif of the poem (cf. Pöschl 1977: 92; Otis 1964: 75-76, 80-81; Hornsby 1970: 60, 89-95, 134-35; Nethercut 1971-72: 131-33; Dunkle 1973: 127-42), but relatively little attention has been paid to the image's function and meaning. Dunkle has attempted to show that hunting appears both as a civilizing activity imposing order on nature and as random violence disrupting that order. Yet there is too little evidence for such 'civilized' hunting, for it consistently anticipates or precipitates catastrophe. Furthermore, a more likely source for the imagery is not Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*, as Dunkle suggests (note 4), but rather the *Oresteia*, where hunting expresses the chaotic cycle of blood vengeance.

[70] The hunting image evolved from the shot of Eros at Medea in Apollonius (cf. *Arg.* 3.284). Dunkle (1973: 142 n15) points out that the representation of the lover as hunter is apparently a Hellenistic motif. In *Aeneid* 7 Eros' arrow is transformed into Allecto's snake and torch (see above, pp. 164-65), but in Book 1 Vergil seems to have rejected the artificiality of the Apollonian Eros scene in favor of a more realistic device, which enables him to depict how Dido's infatuation gradually deepens in the course of the banquet.

Amor's deception anticipates the deer simile,[71] which combines hunting and love motifs, and in turn foreshadows the hunt in which Dido's passion will find its consummation. In this way even the first appearances of Venus (1.314-24) and Aeneas (1.184-93, particularly *agens telis* in 191) as hunters symbolize the nature of his subsequent encounter with Dido.[72]

The metaphorical hunt of the deer simile become real hunts in Books 4 and 7. In the former the description of the chase is rather brief—a glimpse of fleeing deer (4.154-55) and of Ascanius glorying in the pursuit (4.156-59), for the emphasis of the scene is on the storm and the *conubium* in the cave. As a symbol of the passion between Dido and Aeneas this hunt constitutes the last development of the love motif, but it also marks a change, for it is the *malorum causa* (4.169-70). Although *cervi* are mentioned in the chase, the actual quarry is none other than Dido, and her wound has far-reaching consequences for Aeneas. When the betrayal of her love becomes apparent through the preparations of the Trojans and the denials of Aeneas, the chase imagery shifts, as the victim becomes the pursuer. Pursuit is already a theme at the end of her first reply to him (*sequar atris ignibus absens*, 4.384), and almost becomes reality when she briefly considers going after the departing Trojans (4.592-94), but it finds its ultimate expression in her curse:

4.625 exoriare aliquis nostris ex ossibus *ultor*
qui face Dardanios ferroque *sequare* colonos,
nunc, olim, quocumque dabunt se tempore vires.

Thus already in Book 4 we see the amatory hunting metaphor changing to an image of revenge.

This transformation becomes complete in the hunt of Ascanius, which the fury Allecto turns into a *causa laborum*. It is an exact inversion of the previous hunt, for its objectives are not a love union and a fusion of two nations (*communem...populum paribusque regamus auspiciis*, 4.102-103), but hatred, madness, and war. While each figures as a *causa* (7.481-82 ~ 4.169-70), the connection with Dido is suggested by the description of

[71] See Dunkle (1973: 133).

[72] The symbolic function of the two scenes is not weakened by their dependence on Homeric motifs (*Od.* 10.144-73 and 7.18-21; see Knauer 1964: 174-77, 159). I disagree with Dunkle's interpretation: "Aeneas...assumes the responsibility of providing for the survival of his people by hunting the stags.... Thus, hunting in this context represents an act of civilization, a bringing of order out of the chaos and symbolizes Aeneas' most important role in the *Aeneid*" (p. 128). The instinct for survival does not lend moral justification to the actions of the survivor, and hence it is difficult to see Aeneas' hunting as a civilizing act, especially in view of the thematic and verbal connections with the deer simile.

Silvia's wounded stag, which follows the pattern of the deer simile, even though the verbal parallels are not very close.[73]

With her task finally accomplished, Allecto ascends to Olympus and proudly accosts Juno:

7.545 en, perfecta tibi bello discordia tristi;
dic in amicitiam coeant *et foedera iungant*.

She then offers to extend the war even further, should Juno so desire—*tua si mihi certa voluntas* (7.548). This is an inversion of the Juno-Venus scene in Book 4, where Juno proposed (with Venus' approval) to join Dido and Aeneas in marriage:

4.125 adero et, *tua si mihi certa voluntas,*
conubio *iungam* stabili propriamque dicabo.

Venus had expressed concern that Jupiter might not approve of such a union—populos au*t foedera iungi* (4.112), which Allecto now turns into a boastful challenge. In both cases the opposition to Jupiter is the same, whether it manifests itself in promoting an illicit union or in disrupting one that is fated, where *Bellona pronuba* (7.319) replaces *pronuba Iuno* (4.166), and where *conubium* and *amor* yield to *discordia* and the love of insane War (*insani Martis amore*, 7.550).

The final act of war is reserved for Juno:

7.621 impulit ipsa manu *portas*, et cardine verso
Belli ferratos rumpit Saturnia *postis*.

Servius and Horace (*Sat.* 1.4.60-61) cite the Ennian verse Vergil imitates here:

Ann. 266 postquam Discordia taetra
*Belli ferratos postes portas*que refregit.

Vahlen assigns this fragment to the beginning of Book 8 of the *Annales*, which describes the outbreak of the Second Punic War; Norden and others prefer to place it in Book 7.[74] If it is connected with either of the Punic Wars, then Vergil's imitation of the line at this particular point suggests that he may have wished to equate the Latin War with the Punic Wars and thereby again evoke the curse of Dido, which had alluded to Hannibal.[75]

[73] Cf. 4.70-71 ~ 7.493-94, 4.72-73 ~ 7.498-500.
[74] Cf. Norden (1915: 1-40, 153-73) and Otis (1964: 323). Fraenkel (1945: 12-14) doubts that the fragment can be assigned to any particular war.
[75] Cf. 4.625, and Servius' note.

3. *Helen*

Hunting imagery links the Dido episode with the events in Italy and combines in one metaphor the motifs of love and revenge. Closely related to this is the Helen theme, which provides the archetypal pattern for the destructiveness of passion. It is introduced early in the form of Helen's *palla* and *velamen* (1.648-52) given to Dido, which symbolize the destiny and potential destructiveness of Helen. She had brought them with her when she came to Troy seeking a forbidden marriage:

1.650 ornatus Argivae Helenae, quos illa Mycenis,
Pergama cum peteret inconcessosque hymenaeos.

It is an obvious comment on Dido and Aeneas, anticipating their own *inconcessos hymenaeos*, for which Rome and Carthage will have to bear the consequences.[76] The associations with Helen and Paris become even more firmly established in Book 4, when after the hunt Iarbas calls Aeneas *ille Paris* (4.215). The *conubium* in the cave, which is seen as the cause of death and misfortune (*primus leti primusque malorum/ causa fuit*, 4.169-70), is thus equated with the archetypal *causa malorum*—the passion of Paris and Helen.[77]

The Helen theme is picked up again in Book 6. Creusa had long ago predicted a *regia coniunx* for Aeneas (2.783), while Helenus (3.458) and Anchises (5.730-31) had foreseen the war, but it remains for the Sibyl to describe it as a repetition of the Trojan War—again fought over a woman:

6.93 *causa mali tanti* coniunx iterum hospita Teucris
externique iterum thalami.

This half-line recurs in Book 11, where Lavinia along with the Latin matrons is supplicating Pallas Athena:

11.477 nec non ad templum summasque ad Palladis arces
subvehitur magna matrum regina caterva
dona ferens, iuxtaque comes Lavinia virgo,
causa mali tanti, oculos deiecta decoros.

The scene recalls the pictures on Juno's temple (1.479-82), as well as the supplication of Athena in *Iliad* 6, where the goddess rejects the *peplos* of

[76] See Pöschl (1977: 180-81). The Vergilian scene recalls the supplication of Athena in *Iliad* 6, where Hecuba dedicates a *peplos* Paris had brought with him on his return with Helen. Vergil accentuates the baleful connotations by making the *palla* Mycenaean rather than Sidonian.
[77] The notion of Helen as an archetypal *causa malorum* is post-Homeric (cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 681-98). The Vergilian phrase seems to combine the reference to Helen as the νείκεος ἀρχή (*Il.* 22.116) with Homer's apostrophe at the first appearance of Patroclus in Book 11—κακοῦ δ' ἄρα οἱ πέλεν ἀρχή (*Il.* 11.604).

Helen. Here Athena presumably also turns a deaf ear, because Lavinia, the new Helen, is present. But beyond the association between Lavinia and Helen, the repeated phrase evokes the *malorum causa* of Book 4 and thereby emphasizes the link between Lavinia and Dido.[78]

The role of Helen, however, does not altogether fit Lavinia, for although like Helen she is the *causa* in so far as she is the prize over whom the war is fought, she does not share Helen's moral responsibility in the war. She is a pawn manipulated by the opposing forces—passive, colorless, and devoid of the passion so characteristic of Helen. Because she is destined to be the consort of Aeneas and the mother of the Roman race, she obviously cannot play the part of Helen, but neither is she like Penelope, faithfully waiting for her Odysseus. Nothing is said about her feelings for Aeneas, or Aeneas' for her. There is no emotional involvement, for she is a political and dynastic, rather than a personal, choice. On the other hand, there is no question about the love between her and Turnus, as the parting scene in Book 12 shows (12.64-66, 70). We get but a fleeting glimpse of her feelings, but that is enough. The future role of Lavinia precludes a more overt display of love and bars her from actively defying Latinus' decision to give her to Aeneas in marriage.[79] The opposition does not come from Lavinia, who is most affected by it, but rather from Amata, who under the influence of Allecto exhibits the passionate rage of Dido and—by association—Helen. Like Helen and Dido she attempts to arrange a marriage forbidden by fate, and from the Bacchic frenzy to her suicide she follows the pattern set by Dido. Only shortly before her death does she recognize the futility of her opposition—*se causam clamat crimenque caputque malorum* (12.600). But these words also bring back the memory of the first cause—the *conubium* of Dido and Aeneas (*primusque malorum/ causa fuit*, 4.169-70).

4. *Amata*

Just as the hunting imagery articulates both the passion and revenge motifs, so *furor*, which can manifest itself as erotic passion and vengeful fury, is seen both as the cause and the instrument of ruin. The madness of Amata, therefore, evokes Dido's madness not because these are analogous

[78] Knauer (1964: 143 n1) sees in the phrase also a possible allusion to Aeneas' *funeris heu tibi causa fui?* (6.458)—"Wie es überhaupt ein grossartiger Kunstgriff Vergils ist, hier in der Unterwelt der letzten Begegnung mit Dido die Hindeutung auf Lavinia gegenüberzustellen."

[79] See Perret (1967: 347), although W. R. Johnson (1976: 56-58) finds the meaning of Lavinia's blush obscure and sees in the simile (esp. *violaverit*, 12.67) a reflection of Turnus' own *violentia*. Cf. also Putnam (1965: 159-60).

events inevitably calling for similar language, but because Vergil will have wished to suggest an association between the two. Amata is, after all, maddened by the fury Allecto, who was roused by Juno to disrupt the peace and presumably accomplish Dido's curse. The repetition of patterns is a familiar feature of curses, for the punishment invoked usually takes the form of repeating the same task or reliving the same experience. Aeneas had rejected the love and dynastic union offered by Dido; now it is an '*altera* Dido' in the form of Amata who tries to thwart the union between him and Lavinia.

The Bacchic frenzy of Amata (7.383-91) has, of course, a parallel in Helen's behavior at Troy, as described by Deiphobus (6.517-19). There and (if the Helen episode is genuine) also in Book 2, Helen emerges as the embodiment of destructive *furor*, the *communis Erinys* of Troy and Greece (2.573). In general, however, the descriptions of Amata draw primarily on the Dido episode. After trying in vain to influence Latinus, she gradually succumbs to Allecto' venom:

7.374 penitusque in viscera lapsum
serpentis furiale malum totamque pererrat,
tum vero infelix ingentibus *excita* monstr*is*
immensam sine more *furit* lymphat*a per urbem*.

Similarly Dido in the early stages of her passion is seen roaming through the city—*totaque vagatur/ urbe furens* (4.68-69), but as Aeneas' intentions to leave Carthage become obvious, her frenzy takes on Bacchic proportions,

4.300 saevit inops animi totamque incens*a per urbem*
bacchatur, qualis commotis *excita* sacr*is*
Thyias,

and when he refuses to yield to her pleas, she prays for death:

4.450 *tum vero infelix* fatis *ex*terr*ita* Dido
mortem orat; taedet caeli convexa tueri.

Like Dido frightened by the *fata* after Aeneas' refusal to stay, Amata is roused by *monstra* (visions?) after her failure to change Latinus' mind. The thematic similarity is obvious, and in both instances *infelix* foreshadows the end. The transformation of Amata culminates in her leading the Latin matrons in the Bacchic rites. Her bloodshot eyes and savage voice bear witness to the intensity of her madness,

7.399 *sanguineam* torqu*ens aciem*, torvum*que repente*
clamat,

a particularly ominous description, for it evokes Dido just before her suicide:

4.642 at trepida et coeptis immanibus effera Dido
sanguineam volv*ens aciem*, maculis*que trementis*
interfusa genas et pallida morte futura.

All this suggests that Amata's madness will follow the pattern established by Dido to the same self-destructive end.

The echoes from the Dido episode are resumed at the beginning of Book 12, where Amata beseeches Turnus not to fight Aeneas,[80] and especially in the description of her suicide. As she witnesses the fierce attack of the Trojans on her city (12.595-96), she believes Turnus dead, and overcome by anguish and guilt she hangs herself. When the horrid news reaches Lavinia and the Latin women, the halls resound with lamentation,

12.605 filia prima manu flavos Lavinia crinis
et roseas laniata genas, tum cetera circum
turba furit, *resonant* late *plangoribus aedes*.
hinc totam infelix vulg*atur fama per urbem*,

and the whole city is shaken with grief:

12.594 totam luctu CONCUSSit funditus *urbem*.

The scene recalls the commotion following Dido's suicide,

4.665 it clamor ad alta
atria: CONCUSSam bacch*atur Fama per urbem*.
lamentis gemituque et femineo ululatu
tecta fremunt, *resonat* magnis *plangoribus* aether,

which with a brilliant stroke Vergil had linked to the fall of Carthage through the simile that follows:

4.669 non aliter quam si immissis ruat hostibus omnis
Karthago aut antiqua Tyros, flammaeque furentes
culmina perque hominum volvantur perque deorum.

In Book 12 the simile is on the verge of being realized, while Amata's death, like Dido's, becomes an omen of ultimate defeat.

5. *Laomedon*

Book 8 begins with a brief summary of how Italy is convulsed with preparations for the war, and then shifts to Aeneas:

[80] Her appeal to Turnus echoes Dido's first speech to Aeneas. The transition from the speech of Latinus is effected in the same way (*at regina*, 12.54) as the shift to Dido in Book 4 (*at regina*, 4.296). Amata weeps and holds on to Turnus (generum *moritura tene*bat, 12.55); Dido charges Aeneas with not caring about her impending death (nec *moritura tenet* crudeli funere Dido, 4.308). Both Amata and Dido appeal to their tears (*per has ego* te *lacrimas*, 12.56; *per ego has lacrimas*, 4.314) and beg that their pleas be heeded (4.319, 12.60). On *moritura* see W. R. Johnson (1976: 55-56).

8.18 quae *Laomedontius* heros
cuncta videns *magno* cu*rarum fluctuat aestu*.

Yet why should Aeneas at this point be introduced as *Laomedontius heros*? We can hardly be satisfied with the explanation that this is just another heroic epithet used for its majestic sonority. The story of Laomedon cheating Apollo and Poseidon of their wages was well known, and Dido herself made specific reference to it:

4.541 nescis heu, perdita, necdum
Laomedonteae sentis *periuria* gentis?

For her this perjury represented the archetypal crime of the Trojan race[81] and a national characteristic, which Aeneas' conduct only served to reinforce. Although in leaving Dido he had broken no formal contract, her accusations suggest that he betrayed the deeper personal commitment implicit in their love and in so doing remained true to the heritage of Laomedon. There is some poetic justice in the fact that Aeneas, who had sacrificed his *amor* to his mission, should now be hindered in carrying it out by the *amor* of Turnus for Lavinia, and that having disappointed Dido in the hope for an alliance and a marriage, he should in turn find the peace and promises given by Latinus dissolve into hideous war. The epithet *Laomedontius* at the beginning of Book 8 emphasizes this theme of broken promises, and by evoking the sin of Laomedon and Dido's charge of *periuria* it may suggest that past mistakes have come home to roost.

Such an interpretation of the epithet seems to be further supported by the succeeding line, which describes Aeneas' great anxiety: *magno curarum fluctuat aestu* (8.19). It is an echo from the description of Dido, who on the night before Aeneas' departure lies awake torn between love and hate:

4.529 at non infelix animi Phoenissa, neque umquam
solvitur in somnos oculisve aut pectore noctem
accipit: ingeminant curae, rursusque resurgens
saevit amor *magno*que i*rarum fluctuat aestu*.

Mercury's warning to Aeneas repeats the phrase with some variation:

4.564 certa mori, v*ariosque* i*rarum* concit*at aestus*.

[81] This theme already appears in the *Georgics* (1.501-502) and in Horace's Roman Odes (3.3.21-22). Celaeno seems to call the Trojans *Laomedontiadae* for the same reasons (cf. 3.248-49). Not all references to Laomedon in the *Aeneid* are pejorative. Twice Priam is called *Laomedontiades* (8.158, 162), but since he is the son of Laomedon the patronymic has specific rather than generic force. Once the Trojans are *Laomedontia pubes* (7.105), but while there seems to be no pejorative sense here, it cannot be ruled out, especially if we consider the ominous overtones associated with the subsequent embassy to Latinus. Cf. Wiesen (1973: 744-47).

Both exhibit Lucretian and Catullan influence,[82] but the parallel between the two Vergilian lines is too close to be fortuitous, especially if we consider the reference to Laomedon's perjury a few lines hence (4.542). The variation of *irarum* to *curarum*, required by the context, also emphasizes the relationship between cause and effect, between Dido's wrath which leads to her curse, and the war in Italy which constitutes the working out of that curse (*bello audacis populi vexatus*, 4.615) and is the source of Aeneas' present *cura.*

Aeneas agonizes over this crisis late into the night:

8.20 *atque animum nunc huc celerem nunc dividit illuc*
in partisque rapit varias perque omnia versat.

The lines are taken verbatim from the scene that follows the appearance of Mercury, where Aeneas vacillates whether or not to tell Dido about his departure (4.285-86). It appears to be a conventional epic formula, of which Homer and Apollonius can furnish many examples, and Vergil himself uses similar expressions elsewhere (e.g. 5.701-702, 10.680, 11.550-51), but in Vergil epic formulae are often functional as well as decorative. Besides, a repetition of such length is in itself somewhat unusual even for the *Aeneid.* Its occurrence with other echoes from Book 4 rather seems to strengthen the associations between Dido and Italy, so that Aeneas' anxiety in the face of this war balances his concern over Dido's potential reaction to his departure.

Several other elements in this scene also point to a preoccupation with the Dido episode. The night during which Tiber appears to Aeneas,

8.26 *nox erat et terras* animalia *fessa* per omnis
alituum *pecu*dumque genus *sopor* altus habebat,

resembles the night before Aeneas' departure from Carthage:

4.522 *nox erat et* placidum carpebant *fessa sopor*em
corpora per *terras*, silvaeque et saeva quierant
aequora, cum medio volvuntur sidera lapsu,
cum tacet omnis ager, *pecud*es pictaeque volucres,—

even though the primary allusion is to the night during which the Penates had appeared (3.147). But more important for the present discussion is the fact that the whole passage in Book 4 is closely modeled on the scene in Apollonius (*Arg.* 3.744-824) where Medea lies awake at night, torn

[82] Cf. Lucr. 6.34, 74. Catull. 64.62 provides a more exact parallel (prospicit et *magnis curarum fluctuat* undis), but even if *A* 8.19 were modeled on this passage, it would still be strange that in depicting Aeneas' worry over the impending war Vergil should have thought of Ariadna abandoned by Theseus.

between her love for Jason and her devotion to her parents, and contemplates suicide as a way out of her dilemma.[83] The parallel with Dido is obvious and explains why Vergil chose to imitate Apollonius. What is unusual, however, is that he takes from that same Apollonian context the simile describing Medea's anxiety and indecision:

Arg. 3.755 πυκνὰ δέ οἱ κραδίη στηθέων ἔντοσθεν ἔθυιεν,
ἠελίου ὥς τίς τε δόμοις ἔνι πάλλεται αἴγλη,
ὕδατος ἐξανιοῦσα τὸ δὴ νέον ἠὲ λέβητι
ἠέ που ἐν γαυλῷ κέχυται, ἡ δ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα
ὠκείῃ στροφάλιγγι τινάσσεται ἀίσσουσα—

and applies it to Aeneas:

8.22 sicut aquae tremulum labris ubi lumen aënis
sole repercussum aut radiantis imagine lunae
omnia pervolitat late loca, iamque sub auras
erigitur summique ferit laquearia tecti.

Unless we are willing to believe that Vergil culls similes from other poets without considering the contexts in which they occur, it is difficult to imagine how at this point he came to think of Medea's anxiety except by way of the associations with Dido.[84]

6. *Evander*

Because on the whole Book 8 seems to contrast with Book 7, setting calm reflection against frenzied activity and the description of Aeneas'

[83] At times the verbal correspondence is very close: *Arg.* 3.744-45 ~ *A* 4.522-24, *Arg.* 3.751-52 ~ *A* 4.529-31, *Arg.* 3.798-99 ~ *A* 4.547.

[84] The subtlety and complexity of Vergilian associations can be illustrated even further. The caldron simile describing Aeneas' anxiety contrasts with the other simile in Book 7, where Turnus' anger is compared to a boiling caldron:

7.461 *saevit amor* ferri et scelerata insania belli,
ira super: *magno* veluti cum flamma sonore
virgea suggeritur costis undantis aëni
exsultantque *aestu* latices, furit intus aquai
fumidus atque alte spumis exuberat amnis,
nec iam se capit unda, volat vapor ater ad auras.

The similes in *Il.* 21.362-64 and *Arg.* 3.291-95 are relevant here, but Vergil apparently also thought of the caldron simile in *Arg.* 3.756-59 and of his own transformation of the scene in the Dido episode:

4.532 *saevit amor magno*que *ira*rum fluctuat *aestu.*

Despite the Lucretian and Catullan parallels (see above, note 82), it seems likely that the simile in the Apollonian context had suggested the water image in the first place. The connection between Dido's anger and Turnus' of course fits the general thesis developed in this section. Hornsby (1970: 100-101) also contrasts the two similes, but ignores the Apollonian influence in 8.22-25, for which see the fine discussion in W. R. Johnson (1976: 85-87).

shield against the awesome catalogue of Italian warriors, we do not expect to find darker overtones. But there also are a few parallels between the two books,[85] as well as allusions to the Dido episode, which should caution against an overly cheerful interpretation.[86]

The encounter between Aeneas and Evander follows the pattern of the Ilioneus-Latinus scene, but it is even more closely related to the scene involving Ilioneus, Aeneas, and Dido in Book 1. Some of the similarity is merely thematic. Evander recognizes in Aeneas the features and voice of Anchises (8.155-56), while Dido inquires if he isn't his son (1.617-18). Both are well informed about the Trojans: Evander recalling (*memini*, 8.157) how once he had met Priam and Anchises in Arcadia; Dido (*memini*, 1.619) how she had learned about Aeneas and the Trojans from Teucer. Then she proceeds to extend her hospitality to the Trojans:

1.627 *quare agite*, *o* tectis, *iuvenes*, succedite nostris.

Her words are not very different from Evander's invitation to share in the festivities honoring Hercules:

8.273 *quare agite*, *o iuvenes*, tantarum in munere laudum
cingite fronde comas et pocula porgite dextris,
communemque vocate deum et date vina volentes.

The feast to which Evander invites the Trojans (8.175-83) corresponds to the banquet of Dido (1.699-708), and it may be significant that these two are the only detailed descriptions of feasting in the whole *Aeneid*.

These parallels would not be important in themselves, for the kinds of questions asked by a host, the reminiscences of old friendships and social obligations, the feasting and exchange of gifts are epic commonplaces. There is, however, in Evander's speech one fairly striking line that recalls what Dido had said to Ilioneus in Book 1. Evander relates the ties of friendship binding them and adds:

8.169 ergo et quam petitis iuncta est mihi foedere dextra,
et lux cum primum terris se crastina reddet,
auxilio lae*tos dimittam opibusque iuvabo.*

Dido expressed her admiration for the Trojans and sought to allay their fears by offering help:

1.571 *auxilio* tu*tos dimittam opibusque iuvabo.*

[85] Bömer (1944: 327-37) points out the recurring theme of fate's call (culminating in *ego poscor Olympo*, 8.533), which also unifies the two books.

[86] Cf. Guillemin (1951: 275-78), who feels that the parallels merely serve to emphasize the contrast between the two episodes.

Yet her very generosity proves ruinous to herself and her city. The gifts she receives from Aeneas form a symbolic parallel to the Trojan Horse and foreshadow her doom, while her reception of Aeneas and Amor in the guise of Ascanius recalls the fatal generosity of Priam toward Sinon.[87] Just as in Troy the feasting and apparent restoration of peace are followed by the final holocaust, so the banquet at Dido's palace is but a prelude to her frenzied passion and death.

When viewed in this context, can the affirmation of old ties of hospitality be entirely untouched by a sense of irony and foreboding, especially when Evander offers his help in Dido's very words? His alliance with Aeneas, just as Dido's, is not destined to be a happy one. There is a sense of urgency in his parting words to Pallas and an intuitive recognition of what is to come. The prayer to Jupiter,

8.573 Iuppiter, Arcadii, quaeso, miserescite regis
et patri*as audite preces. si* numina vestra
*in*columem Pallanta mihi, *si fata* reservant...,

uses language resembling that of Dido's curse:

4.611 accipite haec, meritumque malis advertite numen
et nostr*as audite preces. si* tangere portus
*in*fandum caput ac terris adnare necesse est,
et *sic fata* Iovis poscunt, hic terminus haeret....

His wish to die at once if Pallas is not destined to return alive,

8.579 nunc, nunc o liceat *crudelem abrumpere vitam*,[88]

resembles Dido's own death-wish:

4.631 invisam quaerens quam primu*m abrumpere* luce*m*.

Finally, in a gesture foreshadowing his grief he collapses and his servants carry him into the house (*famuli conlapsum* in tecta *ferebant*, 8.584), which recalls Dido fainting at the end of her reply to Aeneas:

4.391 suscipiunt *famulae conlapsa*que membra
marmoreo re*ferunt* thalamo stratisque reponunt,

[87] Venus' military metaphors (*capere ante dolis et cingere flamma*, 1.673) suggest that the fire of Troy is to be transferred to Dido.

[88] It is a wish expressed also by the mother of Euryalus,

9.495 aut tu, magne pater divum, miserere, tuoque
invisum hoc detrude caput sub Tartara telo,
quando aliter nequeo *crudelem abrumpere vitam*,

in a scene otherwise reminiscent of Anna's lament over Dido (cf. 473-74 ~ 4.666, 477 ~ 4.667, 482 ~ 4.678, 483 ~ 4.681, 484 ~ 4.684, 487 ~ 4.683-84). The repetition of this phrase by the mother of Euryalus may suggest that he is a double for Pallas, just as the latter doubles for Ascanius.

and may even evoke her suicide (*ferro/ conlapsam aspiciunt comites*, 4.663-64). The parallel seems particularly remarkable, because in the whole poem only Evander and Dido faint after a parting speech.[89] It would seem that here, as in the Latinus scene, the allusions to Dido suggest a return of past patterns, and in so doing they foreshadow and intensify the tragedy of Pallas and Evander.[90]

7. *Pallas*

If Books 1 and 8 correspond to each other structurally, so do Books 4 and 10, where the tragedies of Dido and Pallas find their resolution. Otis sees in these two episodes a contrast between a relationship that threatens Aeneas' mission and one that helps to fulfill it: "Pallas is the object of a *pietas* that not only coincides with Aeneas' destiny, but supplies the emotional power that Aeneas needs to realize it."[91] But we must not forget that in each case contact with Aeneas leads to a tragic death.

One of the difficulties in explaining the associations between Pallas and Dido is that Aeneas' relationship with Pallas, and hence the responsibility he feels for his death, do not seem adequately motivated. Whatever the obligation Aeneas incurred by allying himself with Evander and having Pallas entrusted to his care (cf. 8.514-17), it does not explain his extreme grief and rage at the death of Pallas. We are unprepared for this sudden emotional intensity, for Aeneas' reaction implies deep affection, if not love.

The nature of Aeneas' feelings toward Pallas is suggested primarily through imitation of Homeric patterns. It soon becomes apparent that the primary model for Pallas is Patroclus,[92] and that his death motivates Aeneas to kill Turnus just as the death of Patroclus had motivated Achilles to kill Hector. This provides a partial explanation for Aeneas' rage, and it may help us understand the nature of his responsibility for Pallas' death, which, at least on the symbolic level, is analogous to Achilles' responsibility for the death of Patroclus. Achilles' quest for divine honor and total self-sufficiency ultimately entails the sacrifice of all human commitments, a sacrifice that is symbolized by the death of his dearest friend Patroclus.

[89] Somewhat different is the case of Euryalus' mother, who is taken inside (9.502) for fear her lamentation may affect morale.

[90] Wiesen (1973: 749-50) compares Aeneas to the Wooden Horse: "Each enters the city in the guise of a friend at the apparent bidding of a divinity (cf. 2.192-94 and 8.131), and each secretly carries doom, for the Arcadian world of Evander is destined to pass away as completely as Troy: the Golden Age is to be replaced by the golden roof of the Capitol."

[91] Otis (1964: 351).

[92] Cf. Knauer (1964: 298-315).

Although Achilles and Aeneas stand antithetically opposed, the one pursuing total egoism and the other total selflessness in the fulfilment of a divinely ordained mission, both pay a similar price. Like the heroic self-assertion of Achilles, the self-denial of Aeneas also tends to displace personal commitments. His inability to balance the contradictory claims of love and public duty is most clearly demonstrated in the Dido episode, where ideological and political considerations force him to surrender his deepest feelings.[93] But Dido is neither the first, nor the last victim paving the way to Rome's greatness, as her curse indeed proclaims: *videatque indigna suorum/ funera* (4.617-18). Having made his choice, Aeneas must fully realize that the founding of the Roman race will involve not just hardship and suffering, but great personal loss. The death of Pallas represents this sense of loss at its most profound.

The poignancy of this loss is further enhanced by the fact that Pallas functions as a surrogate son of Aeneas. It is perhaps significant that in his haste to save his father and son from the flames of Troy Aeneas leaves his wife Creusa behind.[94] Throughout the poem Anchises and Ascanius constitute the main reasons for Aeneas' perseverence in the face of adversity. His mission is defined in patriarchal terms; it is a matter of passing dynastic power from father to son, as Apollo's oracular voice had proclaimed (3.97-98). Only through these feelings of duty toward Ascanius, who represents the hope and symbol of the future, does Mercury motivate Aeneas to leave Carthage (4.274-76). In Book 8 we find Aeneas separated from Ascanius and seeking an alliance with Evander, who soon becomes an Anchises-like figure,[95] initiating him into Rome's mythic past and idyllic present, and who sends his son Pallas to fight alongside Aeneas:

8.514 hunc tibi praeterea, spes et solacia nostri,
Pallanta adiungam; sub te tolerare magistro
militiam et grave Martis opus, tua cernere facta
adsuescat, primis et te miretur ab annis.[96]

Unlike Patroclus, who is an established fighter in his own right, though lesser than Achilles, Pallas accompanies Aeneas as an apprentice in

[93] Cf. Enk (1957: 632-40), Wiesen (1973: 753), MacKay (1957: 14).

[94] This has been observed by Fenik (1959: 16-17), who points out similarities between this scene and the Dido episode. The Orpheus-Eurydice episode of the Fourth *Georgic* is of course also relevant here, as Putnam (1965: 41-55) has shown. Note that Creusa's prophecy ends with *nati serva communis amorem* (2.789). Ascanius, the symbol and pledge of their love and thus the embodiment of Aeneas' private *pietas* toward Creusa, in this way becomes identified with his public mission.

[95] Evander stresses the kinship between them (8.132) and relates how he had once met with Anchises (cf. 8.155-68). See also Otis (1964: 334).

[96] Cf. Aeneas' words to Ascanius before he goes out to fight Turnus (12.435-40).

warcraft. The bond between teacher and student is quickly formed, for when Aeneas sails back to his camp in Book 10, Pallas is at his side, plying him with countless questions (10.160-62).[97]

The filial role of Pallas is also brought out in a number of other ways. His prayer to Hercules for assistance—*coeptis ingentibus adsis* (10.461), calls to mind a similar prayer of Ascanius to Apollo—*audacibus adnue coeptis* (9.625). More striking is the similarity between him and Lausus, who matches Pallas in age, beauty, and in his tragic destiny (cf. 10.433-38). Aeneas emphasizes this aspect when in his lament over Pallas he addresses him as *miserande puer* (11.42), echoing his words over slain Lausus (*miserande puer*, 10.825). But particularly relevant for our present discussion is the mutual devotion of Lausus and Mezentius, which provides a parallel for Aeneas and Pallas, and by equating Aeneas' grief with that of Mezentius again stresses his role as a father figure.

In the vengeful carnage Aeneas wreaks among the Rutulians the father-son theme recurs in various forms. He is driven by his devotion to Pallas and Evander—*Pallas, Evander, in ipsis/ omnia sunt oculis* (10.515-16). In atonement for the slain son-figure Pallas he captures four sons of Sulmo and four of Ufens to be sacrificed at the funeral (10.517-20). Then he comes upon Magus who begs him to spare his life:

10.524 per patrios manis et spes surgentis Iuli
te precor, hanc animam serves gnatoque patrique.

Aeneas rejects his appeal to filial and paternal feelings by saying that in killing Pallas Turnus had removed the validity of such an appeal (10.531-34). These are not the words of a guest-friend, but of a father who had lost a son, and they imply that Aeneas at this point equates Evander with Anchises and Pallas with Iulus.

Pallas therefore emerges not just as a surrogate son, but in fact as a substitute victim for Ascanius, who after all must survive to carry on the tradition. Dido had prayed that Aeneas might find himself torn from the embrace of Iulus—*complexu avulsus Iuli* (4.616). It is violent language expressing her deep resentment of his devotion to Iulus and boding something much more sinister than the temporary separation of Books 8 and 9. Her murderous hatred is directed not just at Aeneas, but at Ascanius as well:[98]

[97] On Aeneas' fatherly devotion to Pallas see Otis (1964: 340), Wiesen (1973: 758), and Benario (1967: 25). Raabe (1974: 232-33) objects that the emphasis is on Pallas as the son of Evander (cf. 10.374) and he sees Aeneas' role only as that of an ally and guest avenging his host's son.

[98] Dido in Book 4 is modeled not just on the Apollonian Medea, but also on the Medea of

4.601 non socios, non ipsum absumere ferro
Ascanium patriisque epulandum ponere mensis?
4.605 implessemque foros flammis *natumque* patremque
cum genere exstinxem, memet super ipsa dedissem.

There is reason for her hatred. Ascanius has played a prominent, if unconscious part in her downfall by providing a disguise for Cupid, and then a pretext for Aeneas' departure (4.354-55). But Ascanius soon develops from a passive tool to an active participant. We see him hunting avidly in Book 4, as if in anticipation of his hunt in Book 7, which becomes the cause of the war. In Book 5, mounted on a horse given him by Dido (5.571-72), Ascanius leads the Trojan boys in the *lusus Troiae*, as if to foreshadow the war itself. It is unlikely that Dido's gift horse is benign, for horses have already betokened war at Castrum Minervae (3.537-40), while the Trojan Horse had caused death and destruction.

In view of this it may be significant that the return of Aeneas in Book 10 with the surrogate son Pallas is accompanied by an echo from the Dido episode. It is night, but Aeneas is troubled and does not sleep:

10.217 *ne*que enim *membris dat cura quietem.*

We may recall that Book 4 had started in a similar way, with Dido troubled by her passion and unable to sleep:

4.5 *nec* placidam *membris dat cura quietem.*

Of course, the situation is not the same, for Dido's *cura* is very different from that which keeps Aeneas awake. In her desperate love for Aeneas she forgets her duty as founder and ruler of Carthage, whereas here Aeneas is seen foregoing sleep in dutiful performance of his task:

10.218 ipse sedens clavumque regit velisque ministrat.[99]

Vergil often exploits descriptions of night for their mood, so as to provide an appropriate setting for the various prophecies and directives, such as the appearances of Hector (2.268-73), the Penates (3.147-52), Mercury (4.554-59), Anchises (5.721-23), and Tiber (8.26-35). The sleepless night, however, has particularly strong associations with Dido. Her tragedy is framed by the first night, during which her passions are aroused, and the

Euripides. Like the latter (*Med.* 1251) she addresses the Sun (4.607) in her prayer, and her thoughts of revenge, like Medea's, invariably turn to Ascanius, the son for whom Aeneas was willing to sacrifice her love.

[99] Cf. Vergil's description of Charon conveying the dead across the Styx:

6.302 *ipse* ratem conto subi*git velisque ministrat.*

This echo may also foreshadow the tragic events that lie ahead.

last, which precedes Aeneas' departure and her suicide. Her inability to sleep is stressed on both occasions (4.5 and 529-32) and contrasted with the peaceful slumber of Ascanius (1.691-92) and Aeneas (4.554-55). It is a tragic *leitmotif*. Its recurrence at the time of Aeneas' return with Pallas and the Etruscan allies suggests that the victory predicted by Cymodocea will not be without its price.

The magnitude of this price has become fully apparent when dawn rises after the great battle—

11.1 *Oceanum interea surgens Aurora reliquit,*

to witness the funeral of Pallas. The same dawn had in 4.129 introduced the day of the fateful hunt and the *conubium* in the cave, but it was a day begun on a joyous note. The lively and colorful pageant of the hunting party stands in stark contrast to the solemn funeral procession of the present scene. Dido's horse is richly caparisoned (*ostroque insignis et auro*, 134); Pallas' horse Aethon is unadorned (*positis insignibus*, 89) as it sadly follows the chariot. And there is aged Acoetes, distraught with grief, who once was armor-bearer to Evander, and then to Pallas:

11.31 qu*i* P*arrhasio* Euandro
armiger ante fuit, sed non felicibus aeque
*tum com*es auspiciis caro *datus* ibat alumno.

We may remember that Ascanius also had an armor-bearer, ancient Butes, who previously had served Anchises:

9.647 h*i*c D*ardanio* Anchisae
armiger ante fuit fidusque ad limina custos;
*tum com*item Ascanio pater *addidit.*

It is in the shape of Butes that Apollo had restrained Ascanius from plunging into the heat of battle, and thereby probably saved him from a fate like Pallas'. The parallel between his son and Pallas can hardly be lost on Aeneas. Deeply moved he takes out garments rich in gold and purple (*auroque ostroque rigentis*, 72) to serve as a shroud. Dido herself had once made them for Aeneas:

11.73 quas illi laeta laborum
ipsa suis quondam manibus Sidonia *Dido*
fecerat et tenui telas discreverat auro.

As an act honoring Pallas (*supremum honorem*, 76) it recalls the shrouding of Sarpedon, Patroclus, and Hector in the *Iliad*, but there is no Homeric precedent to explain why Pallas should be covered with a very special

mantle.[100] This allusion to Dido transforms a common burial rite into a symbolic gesture.[101] The memory of a happier past (*laeta laborum*) intensifies the present grief, but the mantle also evokes Aeneas' neglect of his mission and his paternal duty to Ascanius, for when Mercury approaches him to relay the message of Jupiter, he finds him decked out in Tyrian finery supervising the building of Carthage:

4.262 Tyrioque ardebat murice laena
demissa ex umeris, dives quae munera *Dido*
fecerat, et tenui telas discreverat auro.

Aeneas must choose, and he chooses his son.

As Dido's love changes to hate, her gifts become destructive symbols of her wrath. They perpetuate her memory and cast an ominous shadow on later events. Ascanius leads the war games mounted on Dido's stallion; Nisus does not live to claim the Carthaginian crater (*quem dat Sidonia Dido*, 9.266) he was promised. But the baleful implications of her gifts find their most vivid expression in the present scene, where Dido's mantle, which once witnessed dereliction of duty and a painful choice, becomes a shroud for the son-figure Pallas, as if in recognition of her role in Troy's enduring agony.

---

100 Sarpedon is clothed in 'ambrosial garments' by Apollo (*Il.* 16.680) before Hypnos and Thanatos carry him to Lycia. Patroclus is simply shrouded in a thin sheet (*Il.* 18.354-55). In *Il.* 24.580 Achilles leaves two cloaks and a chiton from Hector's ransom as a shroud for his corpse. After Hector's body has been cremated, the remains are wrapped in purple robes (*Il.* 24.796).

101 Cf. Clausen (1964: 144).

APPENDIX

LIST OF REPETITIONS

Criteria for Defining Repetitions

The extent of verbal correspondence between repetitions is measured in terms of 'elements' of half a foot each (either ⏑ ⏑ or —), and those parts which correspond are called 'common elements.' The minimum standards for all repetitions are as follows:

1. All repetitions must have exact metrical correspondence (i.e. the same stressed and unstressed syllables, though not necessarily occupying the same position in the hexameter) in at least *five* of their common elements.
2. A single short syllable (⏑) does *not* count as one element, except when it is at the end of a repetition and in at least one of its occurrences is lengthened by position (i.e. before two consonants or at the end of the hexameter).
3. Variation in the consonants of *one* syllable is permitted if the vowel does not change, but not more than one such variation may be counted.
4. Elision of a long vowel or diphthong occurring in one repetition, but not in the other, may be considered as not breaking up the common elements *only if* it is preceded or followed by at least *three* contiguous repeated elements.
5. In repetitions of *five elements* at least *four* must be contiguous, and the two segments cannot be separated by more than *one* varied element.
   An elided enclitic in one of the repetitions does not constitute such a separation.
6. In repetitions of *six or more elements* at least *three* must be contiguous.

The following examples will illustrate the application of these rules to the various repetitions:

i. *Repetitions of five elements*

a) All elements contiguous:

7.770	*túm pater ómnipoténs* aliquem indignatus ab umbris
10.100	*túm pater ómnipoténs*, rerum cui prima potestas,
2.22	insula, dives opum Priami *dum régna manébant*,
2.455	a tergo, infelix qua se, *dum régna manébant*,

b) Lengthening of short syllable:

G 3.41	intactos, tua, Maecenas, *haud móllia iússā*
9.804	demisit germanae *haud móllia iússă* fĕrentem,
2.512	aedibus in mediis nudo*que sub aétheris áxē*
8.28	cum pater in ripa gelidi*que sub aétheris áxē*

c) Variation of consonants:

1.8	Musa, mihi causas memora, quō *númine laéso*
2.183	hanc pro Palladio moniti, prō *númine laéso*
1.12	*úrbs antíqua fuít* (Tyrii tenuere coloni)
2.363	*úrbs antíqua ruít* multos dominata per annos

d) Elision of long vowel or enclitic:

1.34	*víx e cónspectú* Siculae telluris in altum
11.903	*víx e cónspectu*⁀éxierat campumque tenebat,
1.491	Penthesilea furens *mediís*que⁀*in mílibus* ardet
12.125	pugna vocet. nec non *mediís in mílibus* ipsi

e) At least four elements contiguous:

1.285	servitio premet ac vi*ctís dominábitur* Argīs.
3.97	hic domus Aeneae cun*ctís dominábitur* orīs
1.609	semper honos *noménque tuúm* laud*ésque* manebunt
1.624	Troianae *noménque tuúm* reg*ésque* Pelasgi

ii. *Repetitions of six elements*

4.113	tu coniunx, tibi fas anim*úm temptáre precándo.*
4.413	ire iterum in lacrimas, iter*úm temptáre precándo*
1.339	sed fines Libyci, *genus ín*tract*ábile béllo.*
4.40	hinc Gaetulae urbes, *genus ín*super*ábile béllo*
1.663	ergo⁀*his á*ligeru*m dictís adfátur* Amorem:
9.652	atque⁀*his á*rdente*m dictís adfátur* Iulum.
1.50	talia flammato *secúm* deă *córde volútā*ns
4.533	sic adeo insistit *secúm*que ită *córde volútă*t:
3.40	auditur tumulo⁀*ét vox* reddita *fértur ad aúris*:
3.93	summissi petimus terram⁀*ét vox fértur ad aúris*:
1.152	conspexere, silent *arréctis*que⁀*aúribus ást*ant:
2.303	ascensu supero atque⁀*arréctis aúribus ást*o:
1.414	molirive moram⁀au*t veniéndi* p*óscere caúsas.*
6.488	et conferre gradum⁀e*t veniéndi* d*íscere caúsas.*

iii. *Longer repetitions*

a) Seven elements

2.25	nos abiisse rati⁀*ét ventó petíi*sse *Mycénas.*
2.180	*ét* nunc quod patrias *ventó petíē*re *Mycénas*,
4.372	nec Saturnius *haec oculís* pater *áspicit aéquis.*
9.209	Iuppiter aut quicumque⁀*oculís haec áspicit aéquis.*

b) Eight elements:

5.158 frontibus *ét longá sulcánt* vada *sálsa carína.*
10.197 arduus, *ét longá sulcát* maria⁀*álta carína.*

5.255 *súb*limem *pedibús* rapuit *Iovis ármiger úncis;*
9.564 *sús*tulit alta petens *pedibús Iovis ármiger úncis,*

c) Nine elements:

3.131 *ét tandem*⁀antiquís *Curetum*⁀*adlábimur órīs.*
6.2 *ét tandem*⁀Euboicís *Cumarum*⁀*adlábitur órīs.*

G 3.426 squame*a cónvolvens subláto péctore térga*
2.474 lubric*a cónvolvit subláto péctore térga*

6.118 nequiqua*m lucís Hecaté praeféctit Avérnis,*
6.564 sed me cu*m lucís Hecaté praeféctit Avérnis,*

iv. *Repetitions not meeting minimum standards*

a) Fewer than five common elements:

3.94 *Dárdanidaé* durí, quae vos a stirpe parentum
10.263 *Dárdanidaé*⁀é murís, spes addita suscitat iras,

1.389 *pérge modo*⁀*átque*⁀hinc *té* reginae ad limina perfer.
1.401 *pérge modo*⁀ét, *qua té* ducit via, derige gressum.

3.130 *prósequitúr* surgens a puppi ventus *eúnt*is, (= 5.777)
6.476 *prósequitúr* lacrimis longe et miseratur *eúnt*em.

G 1.386 nunc *cằpŭt ŏbiēctārĕ* fretis, nunc currere in undas
2.751 per Troiam et rursus *cằpŭt ŏbiēctārĕ* periclis.

b) Fewer than five common elements correspond metrically:

1.502 Latonae tacitum *pertémptant gaúdia* pectus:
5.828 *gaúdia pértemptánt* mentem; iubet ocius omnis

4.533 sic adeo insistit se*cúm*que⁀ita *córde volútat:*
6.185 atque haec ipse suo tristi *cum córde volútat*

4.644 *ínter*fusa genas et *pállida mórte futúra,*
8.709 illam⁀*intér* caedes *pallé*ntem *mórte futúra*

c) Repetition of five elements with fewer than four contiguous elements:

5.136 considunt transtris, *inténtaque brácchia rémis;*
5.829 attolli malos, *inténdi brácchia vélis.*

1.1 *árma virúmque* cano, *Troiaé* qui primus ab oris
1.119 *árma virúm* tabulae*que*⁀et *Trōiă* gaza per undas.

1.627 *quáre*⁀*agite,*⁀*ó* tectis, *iuvenés,* succedite nostris.
8.273 *quáre*⁀*agite,*⁀*ó iuvenés,* tantarum in munere laudum

6.160 multa inter sese *varió sermóne seré*bant,
8.309 ingrediens *varió*que viam *sermóne levábat.*

Repetitions that run over from one line to the next without interruption are counted as if they occurred in the same line, thus *cunctí simul óre fremébant / Dárdanidaé* (1.559-60 = 5.385-86) is considered a repetition of ten elements. If the sum of the two lines amounts to a repetition of more than twelve elements, then the lines must be counted as two separate repetitions. Such an enjambed repetition is counted only so far as it continues uninterrupted, except that it may include elements contiguous in one passage, but not in the other, if they correspond metrically. Most often it is a single word that alternates between the beginning and end of a repetition, creating enjambment or adding to the already enjambed line:

5.565 progenies, auctura Italos; *quem Thrácius álbis*
pórtat equús bicolor *maculís,* vestigia primi

9.49 improvisus adest, *maculis quem Thrácius álbis*
pórtat equús cristaque tegit galea aurea rubra,

G 3.15 *Míncius* et *tenerá praetéxit harúndine rípas.*
E 7.12 hic viridis *tenerá praetéxit harúndine rípas*
Míncius

2.74 impetus. *hórtamúr farí quo sánguine crétus,*
3.608 haerebat. qui sit *farí, quo sánguine crétus,*
hórtamúr.

All of these constitute repetitions of ten elements.

Repetitions that do not continue uninterrupted from one line to the next, as for example,

9.339 *ímpastús ceu* plen*ă lĕó per* ovilia turb*ans*
(*suádet ením vesána famés*) manditque trahitque

10.723 *ímpastús* stabula alt*ă lĕó ceu* saepe *peragrans*
(*suádet ením vesána famés*), si forte fugacem...,

must be counted as two separate repetitions (actually only the second line would qualify as a repetition). Similarly, if a line is composed of segments that elsewhere are spread over two or more lines, the segments must be treated as separate repetitions, and can be counted only if they qualify under the regular rules, as for example:

5.149 *cónsonat ómne nemús,* vocem*que*⁀inclusa volutant
litora, pulsati *collés* clamore *resúltant.*

8.305 *cónsonat ómne nemús* strepitu *collésque resúltant.*

Here again only *cónsonat ómne nemús* qualifies as a repetition. Such extra common elements, though they will not be counted for statistical purposes, will in the list of repetitions be indicated by an asterisk appended to the main repetition.

The system of symbols and parentheses adopted for the list below is a modified version of the one used by Knauer in his Homer-Vergil lists, except that here it serves not to articulate the degree of the poet's intent or awareness, but rather to distinguish repetitions of different length. It may be illustrated as follows:

a)	1.520	= *11.248*	repetition of 12 elements
b)	1.161	*G 4.420*	repetitions of 10-11 elements
	1.124	*4.160*	
c)	1.222	1.612	repetitions of 7-9 elements
	5.158	10.197	
	1.92b	12.951b	
d)	4.113b	cf. 4.413b	repetitions of 5-6 elements
	1.80b	cf. G 1.27b	
	1.95a	cf. 1.208a	
e)	4.644	(8.709)	echoes that do not qualify as repetitions and are not counted in the frequency statistics
f)	5.149	cf. 8.305*	the asterisk indicates that there are extra common elements which have not been included as part of the repetition

Whenever appropriate, I have in the case of shorter repetitions (usually 5-7 elements) followed Knauer's practice of indicating the first or second half of the verse by *a* or *b*. References to *Eclogues* and *Georgics* are always preceded by *E* or *G* respectively; references to the *Aeneid* are preceded by *A* only when it is necessary to avoid confusion, otherwise the *A* is usually omitted.

ECLOGUES

Eclogue 1

1	G 4.566
2	E 6.8
7a	(A 9.297a)
16b	A 2.54b
24b	(G 2.341b, G 4.352b)
	(A 1.127b)
29b	cf. E 1.67b
	cf. A 6.409b
37b	(E 7.54b)
46a	cf. E 1.51a
	(E 5.49a)
51a	cf. E 1.46a
52b	(E 2.8b)
57b	(E 10.22b)
67b	cf. E 1.29b
	cf. A 6.409b
71b	cf. A 12.583b
73	(E 9.50)
74	(E 7.44, E 10.77)
78a	cf. E 2.64a*
81b	cf. G 3.308b

Eclogue 2

1	*E 5.86*
	(E 7.55b)
3b	cf. E 9.9

Eclogues

6b	cf. E 3.61b
8b	(E 1.52b)
13b	(G 3.328b)
14b	cf. E 3.81b
17a	cf. E 2.45
18b	cf. E 10.39b
33b	(E 3.101, G 2.529)
34b	cf. E 10.17a
45	cf. E 2.17a
45a	(E 7.9a, 9.39a)
63b	(E 2.64b)
64a	cf. E 1.78a*
64b	(E 2.63b, E 3.64b)
69b	E 6.47b
	cf. G 4.488b
	cf. A 5.465b

Eclogue 3

1b	E 5.87b
43	= *E 3.47*
47	= *E 3.43*
60	cf. A 7.219
61b	cf. E 2.6b
64b	(E 2.64b)
81b	cf. E 2.14b
84a	(E 3.88a)
87	= *A 9.629*
88a	(E 3.84a)
101b	(E 2.33b, G 2.529)
104a	cf. E 3.106a
106a	cf. E 3.104a

Eclogue 4

5	cf. A 7.44b
6b	cf. E 6.41b
	cf. A 11.252b
11a	(G 1.24a)
27b	cf. G 1.394b
	cf. G 4.253b
51	= *G 4.222*
	A 1.58b
54b	cf. E 8.8b
58	E 4.59
59	E 4.58
60a	cf. E 4.62a
62a	cf. E 4.60a

Eclogue 5

8b	(E 5.15b)
15b	(E 5.8b)
19a	cf. E 9.66a
20b	cf. G 3.263b
	cf. A 4.308b
37	*G 1.154*
40	(E 9.19-20)
42	(A 6.380)
45b	cf. E 10.17b
49a	(E 1.45a)
59	cf. G 1.11b
	(G 2.494)
60a	(G 3.537a)
65b	cf. A 5.639b
78	= *A 1.609*
86	*E 2.1*
87b	E 3.1b

Eclogue 6

8	E 1.2
9b	cf. G 2.49b
29a	(E 6.30a)
30a	(E 6.29a)
41b	cf. E 4.6b
	cf. A 11.252b
46b	cf. A 10.191b
47a	cf. E 6.52a
47b	E 2.69b
	A 5.465b
	cf. G 4.488b
52a	cf. E 6.47a
61a	(E 6.64a)
64a	(E 6.61a)
71b	cf. A 4.491b
86b	cf. A 8.280b
	(A 1.374b)

Eclogue 7

9a	(E 2.45a, E 9.39a)
12-13a	*G 3.15*
23b	(E 8.63b)
39a	(E 7.44a)
44	(E 7.39a)
	(E 1.74, E 10.77)
54b	(E 1.37b)
55b	(E 2.1b)
57	(G 1.107)
62	(E 7.64)
64	(E 7.62)
65	E 7.68
68	E 7.65

Eclogue 8

1	*E 8.5*
5	*E 8.1*
8b	cf. E 4.54b
15	*G 3.326*
21	= *E 8.25*, etc. (refrain)
48b	E 8.50b
	cf. A 1.407
49b	(E 8.50a)
50b	E 8.48b
56	cf. E 10.52
	cf. A 3.646
63b	(E 7.23b, G 2.109b)
68	= *E 8.72*, etc. (refrain)
74b	cf. A 2.515b
	cf. A 4.145b
	cf. A 8.285b
85a	(E 8.89a)
88	G 3.467
89a	(E 8.85a)

Eclogue 9

4b	cf. G 3.288b
9a	cf. E 2.3
29	cf. A 1.259
39a	(E 2.45a, E 7.9a)
43a	(E 9.39a)
50a	(E 1.73a)
66a	cf. E 5.19a

Eclogue 10

6b	(E 10.34b)
17a	cf. E 2.34a
17b	cf. E 5.45b
19a	(E 10.24a)
22b	(E 1.57b)
24a	(E 10.19a)
26a	cf. G 3.392a
26b	cf. A 1.584b
28a	(A 4.98a)
34b	(E 10.6b)
37	E 10.41
39b	cf. E 2.18b
41	E 10.37
45a	cf. A 10.237a*
52	A 3.646
	cf. E 8.56
57	G 1.140
58b	cf. G 4.364b
74a	(G 1.43a)
74b	(G 2.19)
77	(E 1.74, E 7.44)

GEORGICS

Book 1

11b	cf. E 5.59b
21a	cf. A 6.64a
21b	(G 2.195b)
24a	(E 4.11a)
27b	A 1.80b
	A 3.528b
28b	A 5.72b
37b	cf. A 6.373b
	cf. A 6.721b
	(A 9.185b)

Georgics, Book 1

40b	A 9.625b
43a	(E 10.74a, G 4.22a)
56a	(G 3.103, 250)
105a	cf. A 1.105a
107b	(E 7.57)
118b	(G 1.325b)
123b	cf. G 1.330b
127	(G 4.157)
135a	(A 6.7)
140	E 10.57
152-53a	G 3.384-85a
154	*E 5.37*
181a	(G 4.406a)
185	(A 4.402*)
200	A 2.169
206b	cf. A 6.335b
	cf. A 7.228b
	(A 1.376b)
213a	(G 3.558a)
235	A 6.486
	(A 1.611b, 6.656b)
237b	cf. A 2.268b
	cf. A 10.274b
	cf. A 12.850b
	(G 3.66b)
250	A 5.739b
264b	(G 2.359b)
294	A 7.14
304	= *A 4.418*
325b	A 2.306
	(G 1.118b)
328a	(G 1.353a)
330b	cf. G 1.123b
349b	cf. A 3.81b
351b	(G 1.394b)
353a	(G 1.328a)
356a	cf. A 3.196a
362	cf. A 12.455
366b	cf. A 9.314b
394b	G 4.253b
	cf. E 4.27b
	(G 1.351b)
402b	cf. A 7.512b
406	*G 1.409*
409	*G 1.406*
412	G 4.55
434b	cf. A 3.98b
439a	cf. G 1.463a
444a	cf. A 3.139a
445b	cf. A 6.592b
447	= *A 4.585*
	= *A 9.460*
463a	cf. G 1.439a
470	cf. A 3.262b
	(A 12.876a)
477	A 10.822
	(A 7.89)
	(G 4.309)
	(A 1.354)
482-83	*A 2.498-99*
489b	cf. A 11.117b
491b	(G 1.501b)
494	*G 2.513*
501b	(G 1.491b)
502	A 4.542
506a	cf. A 6.560a

Book 2

1	cf. G 4.559
4a	cf. G 2.7a
7a	cf. G 2.4a
19b	(E 10.74b)
30b	cf. G 3.275
	cf. A 1.439b
	cf. A 2.174b
	cf. A 4.182b
	cf. A 7.64b
	cf. A 8.252b
43	= *A 6.625*
44a	(A 6.626a)
47a	(G 2.11a)
49b	cf. E 6.9b
65	(G 2.80)
80	(G 2.65)
108b	cf. G 3.200b
	cf. A 1.86b
	cf. A 12.366b
127b	A 12.245b
128b	(G 3.282)
[129]	= *G 3.283*
140b	cf. A 7.281b
145a	(A 11.89)

Georgics, Book 2

145b	A 9.53
149a	(E 9.40a)
155b	cf. A 1.455b
	cf. A 1.507b
158	A 8.149
162b	(G 1.327b)
172b	cf. A 10.12b*
173b	cf. A 8.329b
195	cf. G 3.179
195b	(G 1.21b)
201b	cf. G 2.329b*
208b	cf. A 2.363b
	cf. A 2.715b
	cf. A 7.60b
208-209	(G 4.208-209)
209a	cf. A 2.635a
259a	cf. G 3.123a
280	cf. A 12.450b
291b	A 4.445b
291b-92a	cf. A 6.761b-62a
292	= *A 4.446*
294b	(G 4.208)
298a	(G 2.315a)
314b	A 12.766b
315a	(G 2.298a)
325a	cf. A 7.770a
	cf. A 10.100a
329b	cf. G 2.201b*
341b	(E 1.24b, G 4.352b)
	(A 1.127b)
342b	cf. A 4.578b
343b	cf. A 5.617b
	cf. A 5.769b
	cf. A 6.437b
	cf. A 12.177b
346a	(G 4.51a, A 5.796a, etc.)
359b	(G 1.264b)
360b	cf. A 3.77b
392	(A 9.587, A 11.579)
397	(G 3.425)
429a	cf. G 3.311a
	cf. A 1.633a
	cf. A 6.212a
	cf. A 7.572a
	cf. A 12.107a
472	*A 9.607*
476b	cf. A 9.197b
478b-79a	cf. A 1.742b-43a*
481	= *A 1.745*
482	= *1.746*
484	A 10.452
491b	cf. A 8.334b
494	G 4.382b
	(E 5.59)
513	*G 1.494*
528b	cf. A 3.525b
529b	(E 2.33b, E 3.101b)
535	*A 6.783*

Book 3

13	(A 4.457b, A 6.69b)
15	*E 7.12-13*
21	*A 5.774*
37b	cf. A 6.374b
41b	cf. A 9.804
43a	(A 9.13a)
43b	cf. A 4.303b
	cf. A 9.38b
66	cf. A 11.182
	(G 1.237b)
67b	A 6.275b
103a	(G 1.56a, G 3.250a)
103b	A 5.144b
104	= *A 5.145*
105-106	*A 5.137-38*
110a	cf. A 5.458a
	cf. A 12.553a
122b	cf. G 3.473b
123a	cf. G 2.259a
132a	cf. G 3.409a
158b	cf. A 3.444b
179	cf. G 2.195
200b	cf. G 2.108b
	cf. A 1.86b
	cf. A 12.366b
214b	cf. G 3.495b
220	(G 4.174)
232	A 12.104
233	= *A 12.105*
234	*A 12.106*
237	*A 7.528*
242-43	(G 3.480)

Georgics, Book 3

243b	A 4.525b
245a	cf. G 3.531a
250a	(G 3.103a, G 1.56a)
263	A 4.308
	cf. E 5.20b
275b	cf. G 2.30b
	cf. A 1.439b
	cf. A 2.174b
	cf. A 4.182b
	cf. A 7.64b
	cf. A 8.252b
279	A 10.275
282b	(G 2.128b)
283	[= *G 2.129*]
284b	cf. A 10.467b
288b	cf. E 9.4b
308b	cf. E 1.81b
311a	cf. G 2.429a
	cf. A 1.633a
	cf. A 6.212a
	cf. A 7.572a
	cf. A 12.107a
311b	cf. A 6.809b
314	cf. G 4.539b
315	cf. G 4.124
326	*E 8.15*
328b	(E 2.13b)
372	A 12.750
384-85a	G 1.152-53a
391b	cf. A 6.173b
392a	cf. E 10.26a
409a	cf. G 3.132a
412b	cf. G 3.535b
417b	cf. A 12.660b
421	A 2.381
	cf. A 5.277*
425	(G 2.397)
426	A 2.474
437	*A 2.473*
439	= *A 2.475*
447b	A 8.549b
452b	cf. A 7.559b
467	E 8.88
473b	cf. G 3.122b
480	cf. G 4.223
	(G 3.242-43)
495b	cf. G 3.214b
498a	cf. A 5.329a
516b	cf. A 10.349b
531a	cf. G 3.245a
535b	cf. G 3.412b
537a	(E 5.60a)
541b	(G 3.242, 480)
549b	cf. A 12.717b
552a	cf. A 10.761a
558a	(G 1.206a)

Book 4

7b	cf. A 3.395b
22a	(G 1.43a)
31	cf. A 7.753
42b	cf. A 3.551b
43a	(G 4.52a)
51a	(G 2.346a, A 5.796, etc.)
52a	(G 4.43a)
55b	G 1.412b
58b	cf. A 1.259b
79a	(G 4.188a, A 2.209a)
83b	cf. A 4.563b
86	cf. A 5.596
112b	cf. A 10.707b
	cf. A 12.523b
117b	cf. A 7.35b
124	cf. G 3.315
133	cf. A 1.706a
156	(A 4.403)
157	(G 1.127)
162-63	A 1.431-32
164	*A 1.433*
167	= *A 1.434*
168	= *A 1.435*
169	= *A 1.436*
171b	A 8.449b
172	= *A 8.450*
173	*A 8.451*
174	*A 8.452*
175	*A 8.453*
	A 12.404
186a	cf. G 4.434a*
188a	(G 4.79a)
188b	cf. A 3.75b
193b	cf. A 12.116b

Georgics, Book 4

208b	cf. A 1.31b
208-209	(G 2.208-209)
212b	cf. A 10.182b
218	A 9.401
	A 11.647
222	= *A 4.51*
	A 1.58
223	cf. G 3.480
230	cf. A 11.332
245b	cf. A 10.796b
	cf. A 11.815b
253b	G 1.394b
	cf. E 4.27b
255b	(G 4.472b)
263b	cf. A 8.421b
286	A 1.372
309b	(G 1.477b)
[338]	= *A 5.826*
342b	cf. A 7.396b
352	*A 1.127*
	(E 1.24b, G 2.341b)
355b	cf. A 1.677b
357b	cf. A 3.47b
364b	cf. E 10.58b
376	(A 1.701)
377	A 1.702
378	A 1.706*
382	G 2.494b
406a	(G 1.181a)
420	*A 1.161*
426	A 8.97
427	cf. A 3.142a
434a	cf. G 4.186a
451	A 12.670
467	*A 8.667*
472b	(G 4.255b)
472b-73a	cf. A 6.308b-309a
475	= *A 6.306*
476	= *A 6.307*, A 2.238
477	= *A 6.308*, cf. A 5.553b
479	A 6.438
480	= *A 6.439*
488b	cf. E 2.69b
	cf. E 6.47b
	cf. A 5.465b
496b	cf. A 5.856b
499b	cf. A 5.740b*
501b-502a	A 2.790b-91a
538	= *G 4.550*, A 8.207
	cf. A 1.71b
	cf. A 7.783b
539b	cf. G 3.314
540	*G 4.551*
544	G 4.552
545a	cf. G 4.553a
546b	(G 4.553b)
548a	cf. A 3.548a
550	= *G 4.538*
	A 8.207
	cf. A 1.71b
	cf. A 7.783b
551	*G 4.540*
552	G 4.544
553a	cf. G 4.545a
554	A 2.680
	A 3.26
	cf. A 8.81b
	cf. A 9.120b
	cf. A 10.637b
559	cf. G 2.1
566	E 1.1

AENEID

Book 1

1-6	(4.11-14)
1a	(1.119, 9.777)
	(2.668, 6.651, 9.57)
	(11.747)
4b	(1.130, 5.781)
8b	cf. 2.183b
9b	(10.61b)
10a	(6.403)
10b	(2.11b, 4.78b)
12a	cf. 2.363a
23a	(1.61a)
29b	cf. 12.501b

Aeneid, Book 1

30	*3.87*
	cf. 1.598
31b	cf. G 4.208b
	(G 2.208)
	(2.363, 715, 7.60)
	(9.85)
34a	cf. 11.903a
35a	(3.191, 12.264)
35b	(10.214)
36b	cf. 4.67b
	cf. 4.689b
39-40	(7.304-305)
44a	cf. 11.865a
46-47	(7.308)
48	(3.437)
50b	cf. 4.533b
	(6.185)
51b	cf. 2.304b
55	1.245
	(1.124, 4.160)
57	(1.153)
57b	(1.146b)
58	E 4.51
	G 4.222
60a	(G 2.325a, 4.25a)
	(6.592a, 7.141a, 770a)
	(8.398a, 10.100a)
	(12.178a)
61a	(1.23a)
65	2.648
	10.2
	10.743
68	cf. 8.11
69-70	(7.338-39)
71b	cf. G 4.538b, 550b
	cf. A 7.783b
	cf. A 8.207b
72	cf. 1.496
	(10.225)
73	= *4.126*
80	G 1.27
	3.528
81a	(5.32, 315, 8.175)
	(2.790, 6.628, 7.323)
	(7.471, 8.541, 10.633)
	(12.81, 441)
82b-83a	cf. 8.595b-96a
86b	cf. G 2.108b
	cf. G 3.200b
	cf. 12.366b
87	cf. 2.313
	cf. 11.192
92b	12.951b
	(12.867)
93	9.16
	10.667
	cf. 2.153
94a	cf. 1.208
94b	(4.589)
95a	(2.531, 5.553)
95b	3.322
	10.469
	(5.624)
97b	cf. 7.294b
100-101	(6.87-88)
100b	(8.538b)
101	*8.539*
	cf. 12.328
103b	cf. 2.222b
	cf. 12.795b
	(8.141, 10.262, 11.37, 878)
105a	cf. G 1.105a
107b	(3.557)
112b	cf. 7.159b
113	(6.334)
116	(12.292-93)
118b	(3.197b, 421b, 6.741b)
119a	(1.1a)
119b	(2.763b)
124	*4.160*
	(1.55)
127	*G 4.352*
	(1.155)
127b	(E 1.24b, G 2.341b)
130b	(1.4b, 8.40b)
131b	cf. 1.256b
135	(4.536)
136	(G 4.454-55)
142b-43	(5.820-21)
144	(5.824, 826)
146	(1.57)
147	(5.819)
148	(G 2.279)
150a	(12.656a)

Aeneid, Book 1

151	(1.10, 545)
152b	cf. 2.303b
153a	(1.57)
153	cf. 1.197
	(5.816)
155	(1.127)
	(5.817)
156	(5.817, 819)
	(G 2.41)
159a	cf. 3.229a
	(G 4.387)
	(G 4.418)
160	(G 4.419, 422)
161	*G 4.420*
162a	(1.500a, 9.380a)
	(12.431a)
163a	(3.536a)
165	(1.311)
166-68	(G 4.429, 422, 423)
168b	(5.29)
178-79	(G 1.267)
185b	cf. 12.719b
187b	cf. 12.394b
189b	cf. 3.678b
191a	(4.71a)
197	cf. 1.153
	(5.816)
198	(1.630)
208a	cf. 1.94a
209a	(4.477)
213a	cf. 5.102a
214b	cf. 5.102b
	cf. 9.164
	(G 2.527b)
216	*1.723*
	cf. 8.184a
220a	6.176a
222	1.612
	cf. 1.510b
223a	(12.793a)
223b	(12.853-54)
227-29	(5.779-80)
229b	cf. 2.745b
235b	cf. 4.230b
	cf. 6.500b
236	(1.622, 7.737, 10.53)
237b	cf. 1.260b
239	cf. 7.293*
240-41	(10.49)
241	(G 4.116)
	(12.793)
	(2.619, 3.145)
245	1.55
250	(10.30)
254a	12.829a
	cf. 9.740a
254b	11.725
256a	(12.434)
256b	cf. 1.131b
257b	(3.447a, 4.449a, 7.314a)
	(10.696a)
295b	cf. G 4.58b
	cf. E 9.29
	(3.158, 7.99, 272)
	(12.795)
260a	cf. 5.17
	cf. 9.204
260b	cf. 1.237b
261	(7.402, 1.662)
262	(7.123)
262b	(7.312)
263b	cf. 7.384b
267a	cf. 4.156a
	cf. 10.236a
271	(5.597)
285	cf. 3.97*
294a	(7.607, 609)
295	(7.608, 609, 611)
296b	(9.341, 10.489, 12.8)
298b	cf. 4.347b
299b	(1.718b)
301a	(6.19a)
305a	cf. 4.393a
	cf. 6.9a
	cf. 6.232a
	cf. 12.311a
	(5.26a, etc.)
310	cf. 3.229
311	[= *3.230*]
	(1.165)
313	= *12.165*
	cf. 5.557
	cf. 12.489b
	(7.688a)

Aeneid, Book 1

314b	(8.611b)
324a	(4.158-59)
339b	cf. 4.40b
343b	cf. 10.563b
	(7.537b)
350b	cf. 10.326b
354	cf. 10.822
	(G 1.477, G 4.309)
	(6.738, 7.89)
357	(9.378)
365a	cf. 6.638a*
370a	cf. 9.377a
371	(1.485, 2.288)
372	G 4.286
373b	cf. 2.11b
374b	(E 6.86, A 8.280)
376b	cf. 3.325b
	cf. 6.335b
	(6.692, 7.228)
	(G 1.206)
377b	(3.715b)
378a	cf. 5.26a, 685a
	cf. 9.255a
	cf. 10.783a
	cf. 12.175a
	(1.395a, 4.393a)
	(6.9a, 232a, 12.311a)
378b	cf. 5.632b
380b	cf. 6.123b
389a	(1.401a)
393-95	(12.246-50)
401a	(1.389a)
406	9.17*
406a	(9.16, 8.531)
406b	(7.212b)
407b	cf. E 8.48b
408b	(6.697b)
409	6.689*
414b	cf. 6.488b
428a	cf. 4.266a
431b-432a	G 4.162b-163a
433	*G 4.164*
434	= *G 4.167*
435	= *G 4.168*
436	= *G 4.169*
439a	(4.142a)
439b	cf. G 2.30b
	cf. G 3.275b
	cf. 2.174b
	cf. 4.182b
	cf. 7.64b
	cf. 8.252b
440a	(1.504a)
443b	(4.114, 7.438, 10.62)
446b	cf. 1.613b
	cf. 9.266b
	cf. 11.74b
451b	cf. 2.354b
453a	(5.420a)
455b	cf. 1.507b
	cf. G 2.155b
465a	(G 3.226a)
	(4.395, 5.869, 12.886)
467b	cf. 1.699b
	cf. 2.63b
	cf. 4.162b
	cf. 8.182b, 545b
479-80	(11.477-79)
482	*6.469*
	(11.480)
485	cf. 11.37a
485b	(1.371, 2.288)
	(11.377, 840)
490b	11.663b
491a	(11.662a)
491b	cf. 12.125b
493	(7.805-806)
494	cf. 6.169a
495	(7.249-50)
496	cf. 1.72
496b	cf. 4.60b
496-97	(4.141)
497	4.136b
	cf. 2.40b, 370b
	cf. 5.76
498-501	(4.145-49)
500a	(1.162a, 9.380a, 12.431a)
501b	cf. 6.856b
502	(5.828)
504a	(1.440a)
507b	cf. G 2.155b
	cf. 1.455b
509	(12.399-400)
510	4.288

Aeneid, Book 1

	12.561
510b	cf. 1.222b
	cf. 1.612b
514b	cf. 8.164b
520-21	(7.194)
520	= *11.248*
521	(11.251)
523b	(6.853b)
527	(3.603)
530a	(7.563a)
530	= *3.163*
531	= *3.164*
532	= *3.165*
533	= *3.166*
541b	cf. 1.629b
	cf. 6.807b
	cf. 10.75b
546	(3.339)
550	(1.19, 4.191)
559-60	*5.385-86*
	cf. 2.58-59
	(10.96-97, 11.132)
561	(3.320)
570	(5.630)
571	*8.171*
573	(4.655)
574	10.108*
575-76	(7.263)
580a	cf. 3.343a
	cf. 11.184a
	cf. 12.440a
	(1.699)
	(5.348, 461, 8.115)
	(5.545, 700, 12.697)
	(8.606, 11.904)
581	cf. 4.304
582b	9.191b
	5.748b
584b	cf. E 10.26b
586a	cf. 2.323a
	cf. 2.692a
	cf. 3.90a
	cf. 3.655a
	cf. 6.190a
	cf. 8.520a
	cf. 12.650a
586b	(8.525)
587	(8.523-26)
588b	cf. 2.590b*
	(1.402)
594-95	(8.524-25)
596a	cf. 6.403a
	cf. 7.221a
597	cf. 6.56
	(2.3, 4.85)
598	cf. 1.30
	cf. 3.87
600b	(2.537)
603a	(2.536)
605a	(2.537)
606	10.597
607-608	(E 5.76-77)
609	= *E 5.78*
	cf. 1.624
611b	cf. 6.656b
	(6.486b, G 1.235)
612	1.222
	cf. 1.510b
613a	(8.121, 1.513a)
613b	cf. 1.446
	cf. 9.266
	cf. 11.74
614	(9.5)
	(4.276, 9.319, G 4.444)
615	(9.200)
617b	cf. 9.647b
618b	cf. 3.302b
619	(7.205a*)
	(8.157)
622	(1.236, 7.737)
624	cf. 1.609
627	(8.273)
629b	cf. 1.541b
	cf. 6.807b
	cf. 10.75b
630	(1.198)
632b	cf. 3.264b
633a	cf. G 2.429a
	cf. G 3.311a
	cf. 6.212a
	cf. 7.572a
	cf. 12.107a
637a	cf. 2.486a
	(4.645)

Aeneid, Book 1

638	(2.487)
639b	(12.126)
640a	cf. 3.466a
643a	cf. 10.217a
646b	(3.341b)
647	(7.243-44)
648b	(11.72)
649	1.711*
651b	(6.623b)
655	cf. 1.728
657a	(7.477a)
657b	(4.563)
660b	cf. 7.355b
662b	(1.261, 7.402)
	(4.1-3, 12.801-802)
663	cf. 8.126
	cf. 10.466
	cf. 10.591
	(9.652)
673a	(2.196)
673b	(10.119)
677	cf. G 4.355
678b	(G 4.354b)
680b	(10.86b)
687	(8.405)
691b	cf. 8.30b
	(5.836, 8.406b*)
	(4.5*)
694-95	(2.253-54)
699a	cf. 11.184a
	(1.580, 5.545, 700, 12.697)
	(5.348, 461, 8.115)
	(8.606, 11.904)
699b	8.182b
	cf. 1.467b
	cf. 2.63b
	cf. 4.162b
	cf. 8.545b
701a	(G 4.376)
702	G 4.377
706	cf. G 4.133
	(G 4.378-79*)
711	1.649*
716b	cf. 10.789b
718b	(1.299b)
722	7.693
723	*1.216*
	(2.268, 8.407)
724	*7.147**
725b	(5.149b)
728	cf. 1.655
729a	cf. 3.526a
730b	cf. 11.241b
732-33a	*4.111**
735b	cf. 8.173b
741b	(4.481b, 8.136b)
742b-43a	cf. G 2.478b-79a*
744	= *3.516*
745	= *G 2.481*
746	= *G 2.482*
749a	cf. 4.68
	cf. 4.596a
	cf. 6.456a
750a	cf. 10.839a
754	(2.36, 65, 309-310)
755b-56	(5.626)

Book 2

1	(3.716, 718)
1b	cf. 8.520b
2	cf. 3.716a
3	(1.597, 4.85)
3b	(4.419b)
7a	(2.252, 785)
8b	(3.198)
	(5.738, 835)
9	4.81
10a	(6.133a, 11.323a)
10b	cf. 3.299*
11b	cf. 1.373b*
	cf. 4.78b
	(1.10)
14b	(8.47b)
21a	cf. 10.260a
22b	cf. 2.455b
25b	cf. 2.180b
27a	cf. 6.574a
27b	(6.88b)
28	5.612
35b	cf. 11.314b
36	(1.754, 2.65, 309-310)
40a	(12.448)

Aeneid, Book 2

40b	2.370b
	5.76b
	cf. 1.497b
	cf. 4.136b
46b	(2.237b)
54b	E 1.16b
56b	cf. 4.343b
57b	(1.295-96a)
58-59a	cf. 1.559-60a
	cf. 5.385-86a
63b	cf. 1.467b
	cf. 1.699b
	cf. 4.162b
	cf. 8.182b
	cf. 8.545b
65	(1.754, 2.36, 309-310)
67	cf. 12.213a
70b	(12.793b)
74	*3.608-609a*
	cf. 4.191b
75b	cf. 10.152b
[76]	= *3.612*
81b	(2.119b)
93	(5.350)
97	(4.169)
104a	(2.122a)
106b	(2.152b)
107b	cf. 10.556b
	cf. 11.685b
119b	(2.81b)
120a	cf. 5.404a
	cf. 8.530a
	cf. 9.123a
120b-21a	*12.447b-48a*
	6.54b-55a*
	cf. 7.801b
	(8.390, 11.296*, 12.66)
122a	(2.104a)
123b	cf. 6.711b
125a	cf. 11.407a
127b	cf. 11.115b
133	cf. 2.684
	(12.173)
138a	cf. 4.33a
147b	cf. 8.126b
	cf. 10.466b
152b	(2.106b)
153	9.16b-17a
	cf. 1.93b
166	9.151
169	G 1.200
174b	cf. G 2.30b
	cf. G 3.275b
	cf. A 1.439b
	cf. A 4.182b
	cf. A 7.64b
	cf. A 8.252b
180b	cf. 2.25b
183b	cf. 1.8b
186b	cf. 6.178b
194	3.505
196	(1.673)
197	11.404
198	cf. 9.148
199a	(12.244*)
204b	(G 2.152-54)
209a	(G 4.79, 188)
209b	cf. 6.477b
212b	(5.90*)
213a	cf. 2.230a
214a	cf. 6.22a
222	(2.488)
222b	cf. 1.103b
	cf. 12.795b
	(10.262b*, 11.878b*)
	(8.141b, 11.37b)
228a+229a	(2.309a+310a)
230a	cf. 2.213a
234	cf. 9.196
237b	(2.46b)
238a	(9.676a)
238b	G 4.476b
	A 6.307b
243b	cf. 10.488b
250b	(6.539a, 8.369a)
252a	(2.7a)
253-54	(1.694-95)
253a	(2.1, 9.190, 237)
253b	(G 4.190, A 2.214-15)
	(A 8.369)
256a	cf. 3.657b
261b	cf. 2.762b
265b	cf. 9.189b
	cf. 9.236b

Aeneid, Book 2

	(3.630)
266b+267b	(4.141b+142b)
268	(1.723, 8.407)
268b	cf. G 1.237b
	cf. 10.274b
	cf. 12.850b
	(G 3.66b)
269a	(G 1.238)
270a	(12.908)
271-72	(5.721-23)
280a	cf. 3.299a
	cf. 8.164a
283a	(6.687a)
284b	(G 1.118b)
288	(1.371, 1.485)
289a	(3.44a)
290b	cf. 2.603b
293b	(2.747b-48a)
297b	cf. 5.660b
298b	cf. 12.620b
302b	cf. 2.458
	cf. 8.366b
303b	cf. 1.152b
304b	cf. 1.51b
304-308	(12.521-24)
306b	G 1.325b
	(G 1.118b)
307b	(7.381b, 10.249b)
307b+308b	(4.71a+72a)
309a+310a	(2.228a+229a)
309b-310a	(2.36, 65, 1.754)
309a	(3.375)
313	11.192
	cf. 1.87
	cf. 12.756
314a	(3.307a, 7.460a)
315a	cf. 9.792a*
317b-18a	cf. 8.80b-81a
319b	cf. 3.80b
323a	cf. 1.586a
	cf. 2.692a
	cf. 3.90a
	cf. 3.655a
	cf. 6.190a
	cf. 8.520a
	cf. 12.650a
324b	cf. 8.334b
	cf. 10.457b*
	(G 2.491b)
325-26a	cf. 6.64b-65a*
328a	(2.475a)
332a	cf. 12.133a
	(2.450a)
335b	(9.518)
336b	(2.777b, 5.56b, 6.368b)
338b	cf. 12.409b
340b	cf. 2.428b
341b	(2.386b, 424b)
348b	cf. 5.729b
	(5.389b)
352a	cf. 5.235a
	cf. 6.264a
354b	cf. 1.451b
356-58	(9.62-64)
358b	cf. 2.527b
	(2.664b, 12.682a)
360b	6.866
363a	cf. 1.12a
363b	cf. G 2.208b
	cf. 2.715b
	cf. 7.60b
	(9.85b)
370	2.40
	5.76
	cf. 1.497b
	cf. 4.136b
381	cf. G 3.421*
383	(2.409*)
386b	(2.341b, 424b)
397	cf. 11.631
398b	(9.527b)
399b	cf. 3.71b
	cf. 6.4b
401b	cf. 9.152b*
403b	cf. 3.321b
407b	(2.588b)
409	(2.383*)
411b	11.885b
414a	cf. 7.582a
415a	(2.500)
415b	cf. 5.824b
	cf. 11.171b
	cf. 11.598b
416	(7.387)

Aeneid, Book 2

419	(7.530)
420b	(6.268*, 452-53)
424b	(2.341b, 386b)
426b-27	7.536b-37*
428b	cf. 2.340b
431	(6.226)
445b	cf. 12.132b
	(7.160b)
447a	cf. 11.846a
450a	(2.332a)
452b	(12.799b)
455b	cf. 2.22b
458	cf. 2.302b
466a	(8.525a)
469	6.273
469b	(2.485b)
473	*G 3.437*
474	G 3.426
475	= *G 3.439*
475a	(2.328a)
479a	cf. 7.783a
	cf. 12.579a
485b	cf. 6.427b
	cf. 11.423b
	(2.469b)
486a	cf. 1.637a*
	(4.645a)
487b	cf. 12.607b
	(4.668b, 5.228b)
488a	(4.667b)
488b	11.832b-33a
	(2.222)
494b	cf. 12.577b
498a	(5.215a)
498b-99a	*G 1.482b-83a*
500	(2.413)
506	(G 2.288)
508	cf. 7.59
511b*	cf. 9.554b*
512b	cf. 8.28b
515b	cf. E 8.74b
	cf. A 4.145b
	cf. A 8.285b
527b	cf. 2.358b
	(2.664b, 12.682a)
530	(12.754)

531	11.887
	(1.95a, 5.553b, 6.308b)
	(G 4.477b, A 2.681b)
535b	cf. 12.351b
536a	(1.603a)
537a	(1.600b)
537b	(1.605a)
550a	(10.743a)
552-53	(12.302-304)
552	(10.535)
553b	cf. 10.536b
557a	(12.15a)
560	(10.824)
567a	(5.268a, 864a, 8.585a)
	(11.487a)
576b	(12.949)
588b	(2.407b)
590b	cf. 1.588b*
593	cf. 7.451
	cf. 11.107b
	cf. 12.358b
594b	(4.564b)
595b	(2.599b)
596b	cf. 4.599b
597b-98a	2.651b-52a
599b	(2.595b)
603b	cf. 2.290b
614a	(2.627a, 671a)
617a	(G 1.328a, 353a)
619b	(1.241b, 4.639b)
621	cf. 7.619
624b	cf. 9.145b
625	3.3
626a	(4.441a)
627a	(2.614a, 671a)
628a	(4.443a)
629	(4.444-445b)
635a	cf. G 2.209a
637a	(2.654a)
638b	(9.255b)
641	cf. 4.340
648b	1.65b
	10.2b
	10.743b
651b-52a	2.597b-98a
654a	(2.637a)
663b	cf. 3.332b
664b	(2.358b, 527b, 12.682a)

Aeneid, Book 2

668a	(1.1a)
668b	(11.476b)
670b	(4.659b)
671a	(2.614a, 627a)
676b	cf. 11.411b
679a	cf. 10.651a
679b	cf. 7.502b
680	G 4.554
	A 3.26
	A 8.81
	cf. A 9.120b
	cf. A 10.637b
681b	cf. 11.887b
	(5.553b, 6.308b, G 4.477b)
	(2.531b)
684b	cf. 2.133b
685a	cf. 6.491a
687a	cf. 6.679a
	(3.525a, 6.713a, 867a)
	(3.9a, 263a, 539a, 558a)
	(6.854a)
688b	(5.686b)
689a	cf. 4.206a
	cf. 5.687a
	cf. 9.625a
690a	(4.208a)
690b	(5.688)
691a	(3.89a*)
692a	cf. 1.586a
	cf. 2.323a
	cf. 3.90a
	cf. 3.655a
	cf. 6.190a
	cf. 8.520a
	cf. 12.650a
693a	cf. 9.631a
697a	(5.526a)
702a	(G 1.498a, 9.247a)
	(4.680-81)
703b	(9.247b)
709a	cf. 12.203a*
710b	(2.678b)
713a	(8.597a)
715a	cf. 8.598a
	cf. 7.172b
715b	7.60b

	cf. G 2.208b
	cf. A 2.363b
	cf. A 9.85b
717	(2.320)
725a	(G 4.487a)
725b	(6.633b)
729b	(11.550)
730	11.621
	cf. 5.159
	cf. 9.371
730a	(G 4.485a)
731	(G 4.485b, 488a)
737b	11.530
	cf. 9.385b
739a	(G 4.490a, 9.389a)
745b	cf. 1.229b
747-48	(2.293b)
749b	cf. 11.188b
	cf. 6.217b
	cf. 6.681b
	cf. 10.550b
	cf. 12.275b
753b-54a	*9.392b-93a*
755b	(9.393b)
759a	(12.46a)
761a	cf. 12.476a
762b	cf. 2.261b
763b	(1.119b)
773a	(3.150, 8.33a)
773b	(8.557)
774	= *3.48*
	4.280b
	12.868b
775	= *3.153*
	= *8.35*
776	6.135
777a	(G 4.465a)
777b	cf. 5.56b
	cf. 6.368b
	(2.336b)
779	7.558
	cf. 10.437b
780	cf. 3.495b
781b+782b	(3.500, 5.82b+83b)
783b	(7.56b, 11.371b)
785	(2.7a, 252a)
788a	(6.461a)
789a	(G 4.497a, 5.738a, 11.827a)

Aeneid, Book 2

790a	cf. 6.628a
	cf. 7.323a
	cf. 7.471a
	cf. 8.541a
	cf. 10.633a
	cf. 12.81a
	cf. 12.441a
	(1.81a, 5.32a, 315a, 8.175a)
790b-91a	G 4.501b-502a
	A 4.390b-91a
	(7.449, 10.554b-55a)
791	cf. 5.526b
	(G 4.499-500, 5.740)
792	= *6.700*
	(10.685a)
793	= *6.701*
794	= *6.702*
795	(6.899b)
799a	cf. 4.417a
	(5.293a, 9.720a)

Book 3

3	2.625
4b	4.468b
9	cf. 3.263a
	cf. 3.539a
	cf. 3.558a
	(2.687a, 3.525a, 6.713a)
	(6.867a, 679a, 854a)
12	8.679
16a	cf. 10.43a
16b	(3.78a)
	(3.223b)
19b	cf. 8.103b
21b	cf. 5.236b
23	(G 2.447*)
26	G 4.554
	2.680
	cf. 8.81b
	cf. 9.120b
	cf. 10.637b
30	3.259
34a	cf. 10.890a
37a	cf. 11.631a

40	cf. 3.93b
	(7.95)
44a	(2.289a)
47b	cf. G 4.357b
48	= *2.774*
	4.280b
	12.868b
52	cf. 8.647
54b	(3.156b)
56	4.412
57b	cf. 3.308b
	cf. 9.475b
	(11.819b)
65	= *11.35**
68	(6.506)
69a	(8.407a)
	(9.79)
70b	cf. 5.764b*
71b	cf. 3.676b*
	cf. 2.399b
	cf. 6.4b
75b	cf. G 4.188b
77b	cf. G 2.360b
78a	(3.16b)
80b	cf. 2.319b
81b	10.538b
	cf. G 1.349b
83a	11.165a
86a	(1.28a)
87	*1.30*
	cf. 1.598
89a	(2.691a*)
90a	cf. 2.323a
	cf. 1.586a
	cf. 2.692a
	cf. 3.655a
	cf. 6.190a
	cf. 8.520a
	cf. 12.650a
90b	cf. 8.525b
93b	cf. 3.40
94a	(10.263a)
97a	(5.638a, 7.122a, 8.39a)
97b	cf. 1.285b
98b	cf. G 1.434b
102	8.356
	(8.312b)
114a	(5.58a)

Aeneid, Book 3

115a	(5.59a)
121a	(7.392a, 8.554a)
127-28	(5.140-41)
130	= *5.777*
	(6.476, 12.73)
131	6.2
	cf. 3.569b
133b	cf. 7.671b
135b	cf. 8.497b
139a	cf. G 1.444a
142a	cf. G 4.427
145	(1.241b, 2.619b)
147a	8.26a
	(4.522a)
	(9.224)
147b	(8.27b)
150a	(2.773a, 8.33a)
153	= *2.775*
	= *8.35*
155	cf. 7.221b
156b	(3.54b)
157b	cf. 10.269b
	(4.313b, 582b)
158	(1.259b, 7.99, 272, 12.795)
160	(5.769)
163	= *1.530*
164	= *1.531*
165	= *1.532*
166	= *1.533*
167b	cf. 7.240b
169a	(8.59a, 10.241a)
169-170a	(12.75-76a)
175	9.812
	cf. 7.459
178b	cf. 8.617b
182b	5.725
189	(7.433)
189b	cf. 4.577b
191a	(1.35a, 12.264a)
192	5.8
193b	cf. 5.9b
194	*5.10*
	cf. 4.702
195	= *5.11*
196a	cf. G 1.356a
197b	(1.118b, 3.421b, 6.741b)

198b	(2.8b, 5.738b, 835b)
207	(3.560b)
207b	(5.140a)
208	= *4.583*
	(3.290b, 5.778b)
209a	cf. 12.768a
211b	(3.713b)
215b	(12.441b)
219a	(3.441a)
220	cf. 8.360
229a	cf. 1.159a
229b	cf. 1.310b
[230]	= *1.311*
235	cf. 11.113
236a	cf. 3.561a
239b	(10.454b)
241	(G 1.470, A 3.262b)
246b	cf. 11.377b
248a	(G 1.502a, A 4.542a)
	(7.105b, 8.18a, 158a, 162a)
250	= *10.104*
	cf. 5.304a
251a	(10.100a)
	(G 2.325a, A 4.25a)
	(6.592a, 7.141a, 770a)
	(8.398a)
	(12.178a)
255a	(6.140a)
257b	(7.125b)
259	3.30
	cf. 6.290
262b	cf. G 1.470
	(A 3.241, A 12.876a)
263a	cf. 3.9a
	cf. 3.539a
	cf. 3.558a
	(2.687a, 3.525a, 6.713a)
	(6.867a, 679a, 854a)
264b	cf. 1.632b
276b	(3.293b)
277	= *6.901*
278a	cf. 8.247a
288b	cf. 5.111b
289b	cf. 4.573b
290	= *5.778*
	(3.208b, 4.583b)
293b	(3.276b)
	(3.441b)

Aeneid, Book 3

298b-99a	8.163b-64a
	cf. 2.280a
299b	cf. 2.10b
302a	cf. 8.104a
302b	cf. 1.618b
307a	(2.314a, 7.460a)
308b	cf. 3.57b
	cf. 9.475b
	(11.819b)
310b	cf. 6.456b
311a	(1.582a, 615a, 2.289a)
	(3.374a, 435a, 4.560a)
	(5.383a, 474a, 709a)
	(8.59a)
320	(1.561)
321b	cf. 2.403b
322b	1.95b
	10.469b
	(5.624)
325a	(12.236a)
325b	cf. 1.376b
	(G 1.206b)
	(6.335b, 692b, 7.228b)
327b	(5.296b)
331b	cf. 4.471b
332b	cf. 2.663b
338b	3.715b
339b	(1.546b)
341b	(1.646b)
343	*12.440*
	cf. 1.580a
348a	cf. 9.501b
358b	cf. 5.464b
369a	cf. 4.356a
	cf. 4.378a
374a	(1.582a, 615a, 2.289a)
	(3.311a, 435a, 4.560a)
	(5.383a, 474a, 709a)
	(8.59a)
374b	cf. 4.310b
375a	(2.309a)
379a	cf. 6.759a
	(7.40a, G 4.150a, 286a)
380b	cf. 5.606b
	cf. 9.2b
	cf. 9.745b

	cf. 9.802b
	cf. 10.760b
	cf. 12.156b
389b	cf. 6.714b
	cf. 10.833b
390	= *8.43*
391	= *8.44*
392	= *8.45*
393	[*8.46*]
395a	cf. 10.113a
395b	cf. G 4.7b
421b	(1.118b, 3.197b, 6.741b)
422b-23a	cf. 8.24b-25a
	(3.576)
427b	cf. 5.372b
	cf. 8.330b
430	5.131*
437	(1.48b)
438a	(8.60a)
439	8.61
441a	(3.219a)
441b	(3.293b)
444b	cf. G 3.158b
447a	(1.257a, 4.449a, 7.314a)
	(10.696a)
457a	(6.76a)
459	*6.892*
462a	(4.223a, 5.548a)
466a	cf. 1. 640a
467	*5.259-60a*
	7.639-40a
471	8.80
482a	(G 1.392a, G 2.429a)
	(G 3.311a)
	(1.633a, 6.212a, 475a)
	(7.572a)
	(8.465a, 10.812b, 11.203a)
	(12.107a, 481a, 746a)
485b	cf. 5.16b
	cf. 5.79b
	cf. 5.464b
	cf. 5.532b
	cf. 7.330b
	cf. 8.559b
	cf. 12.228b
	(9.280, 11.501)
492b	(4.30b, 6.867b, 11.41b)
495b	cf. 2.780b

Aeneid, Book 3

500	(2.781b-82b)
	(5.82b-83b)
505	2.194
510b	cf. 6.162b
511a	(8.607b)
511b	(G 4.190, 7.446b, 11.424b)
513a	(8.414-15)
516	= *1.744*
521a	cf. 7.25a*
521b	(5.42b)
524b	cf. 12.257b*
525a	cf. 6.713a
	cf. 6.867a
	(3.9a, 263a, 539a, 558a)
	(2.687a, 6.679a, 854a)
525b	cf. G 2.528b
526a	cf. 1.729a
527a	cf. 8.680a
	cf. 10.261a
	(4.554a, 5.775a)
528b	G 1.27b
	A 1.80b
532b	cf. 5.177b
533a	(3.570a)
537a	cf. 6.243a
539a	cf. 3.9a
	cf. 3.263a
	cf. 3.558a
	(2.687a, 6.679a)
	(3.525a, 6.713a, 867a)
	(6.854a)
548a	cf. G 4.548a
	(A 3.207b)
	(5.140a, 749a, 6.177a)
	(7.156a, 11.713a)
551b	cf. G 4.42b
557	(1.107, 9.714*)
558a	cf. 3.9a
	cf. 3.263a
	cf. 3.539a
	(2.687a, 6.679a)
	(3.525a, 6.713a, 867a)
	(6.854a)
560b	cf. 5.189b*
	(3.207)
561a	cf. 3.236a

	(11.755b, 12.481a)
569b	cf. 3.131b
	cf. 6.2b
570a	(3.533a)
576	(3.422b-23a, 8.24b-25a)
585	(8.590b)
587b	cf. 12.846b
	(G 1.247b)
588a	(4.6a)
588b	cf. 11.4b
589	= *4.7*
	cf. 11.210b
590a	(4.8a)
	(1.509a, 535a)
599b	(9.429b)
603	(1.527)
608b-609a	*2.74*
	cf. 4.191b
610b	(12.506b)
612	[= *2.76*]
613b	3.691b
614a	(3.691a)
617b	cf. 8.424b
619b	cf. 11.638b
626b	cf. 9.472b
630b	(2.265b, 9.189b, 236b)
638a	cf. 5.34a
646	E 10.52
	A 7.404
	cf. E 8.56
646b-47a	(G 2.471b)
649b	(G 2.34b)
655a	cf. 1.586a
	cf. 2.692a
	cf. 6.190a
	cf. 8.520a
	cf. 12.650a
	cf. 2.323a
	cf. 3.90a
657b	cf. 2.256a
658	cf. 4.181
660b	(8.581b)
664a	cf. 8.230a
	cf. 10.718a
665b	(4.246b)
667b	(4.575b)
669b	cf. 6.547b
670	7.591

Aeneid, Book 3

676b	cf. 3.71b*
678b	cf. 1.189b
683	7.23
	(5.32b-33a)
685b	cf. 9.143b
	(10.511b)
691a	(3.614a)
691b	3.613b
708b	cf. 7.199b
713b	(3.211b)
714b	(8.594b)
715b	3.338b
	(1.377b, 538)
716a	cf. 2.2
716b	(2.1)
718a	(2.1a)

Book 4

1a	(4.296a, 504a, 12.54a)
1-2a	(12.5)
1b-3b	(1.662b, 12.801b-802b)
4b	(4.67b, 689b)
	(1.36b)
5	10.217
	(1.691b*, 8.30b)
6a	(3.588a)
6	*7.148*
7	= *3.589*
	cf. 11.210b
8	(3.590a)
20a	(E 1.31a)
24b	(10.675b*, 12.883b*)
25a	(G 2.325a, A 1.60a, 6.592a)
	(7.141a, 770a, 8.398a)
	(10.100a, 12.178a)
26b	cf. 6.462b
30b	(3.492b, 6.867b, 11.41b)
33a	cf. 2.138a
39b	(12.237b)
40b	cf. 1.339b
57	8.544
	cf. 6.39b
	cf. 5.96b
59b	(4.16)
60b	cf. 1.496b
61b	cf. 5.479b
	cf. 6.245b
65a	(8.627a)
66-67	(8.388-89, 12.801)
66b	(G 3.271b)
67b	4.689b
	cf. 1.36b
	(4.4b)
68a	cf. 1.749a
	cf. 4.596a
	cf. 6.456a
71	8.694b
71a	(1.191a)
71a+72a	(2.307b+308b)
73	(12.415)
78b	cf. 2.11b
	(1.10b)
81	2.9
85	cf. 4.296b
	(1.597, 2.3)
91a	(7.287a, 308a)
97b	cf. 4.265b
98a	(E 10.28a)
109b	cf. 8.15b
	cf. 10.49b
	(5.22b, 12.677b)
111	*1.732-33a**
112b	(7.546b, 8.56b, 12.822b)
113b	cf. 4.413b
114b	(1.443b, 7.438b, 10.62b)
115b	8.49b
116b	8.50b
	(11.315)
119	*5.65*
120b	4.161b
121a	(9.418a, 12.737a)
124	= *4.165**
125a	(4.166a)
125b	7.548b
126	= *1.73*
129	= *11.1*
130b	cf. 8.499b
	cf. 9.226b
	(8.606b)
135b	(5.817-18, 12.372)
136b	1.497b
	cf. 2.40b

Aeneid, Book 4

	cf. 2.370b
	cf. 5.76b
137b	cf. 12.416b
139b	cf. 5.313b
141b	7.55b
	(1.496-97)
142a	(1.439a)
141b+142b	(2.266b+267b)
145b	cf. E 8.74b
	cf. A 2.515b
	cf. A 8.285b
145-49	(1.498-501)
149b	(7.383b, 8.414b)
155a	cf. 12.463a
156a	cf. 1.267a
	cf. 10.236a
158a+159a	(1.324a)
158b	cf. 9.730b
160	*1.124*
	(4.210b)
161b	4.120b
162b	cf. 1.467b
	cf. 2.63b
	cf. 8.182b
	cf. 8.545b
165	= *4.124**
166a	(4.125a)
166b	(7.319a)
169a	(2.249a)
169b-70a	cf. 7.481b-82a
	(6.93, 11.361, 480)
173b	(4.666b, 7.104b)
177	= *10.767*
181a	cf. 3.658a
182b	cf. G 2.30b
	cf. G 3.275b
	cf. A 1.439b
	cf. A 2.174b
	cf. A 7.64b
	cf. A 8.252b
186b	(7.512)
191b	cf. 1.19b
	cf. 2.74b
	cf. 3.608b
	(1.550b)
197a	cf. 6.889a
197b	11.342b
206a	cf. 2.689a
	cf. 5.687a
	cf. 9.625a
208a	(2.690a)
210b	(1.124, 4.160)
215-16	(12.99-100)
219	*6.124*
220	12.670
223a	(3.462a, 5.548a)
224a	cf. 9.100a
226	(4.270b, 357b, 378b)
227b	cf. 12.554b
230b	6.500b
	cf. 5.45b
	cf. 1.235b
232	*4.272*
	(6.405a)
233	[= *4.273*]
234a	(4.274a)
234b	(G 2.172b, A 10.12b)
235a	cf. 4.271a
	cf. 12.796a
	(8.15a)
246b	(3.665b)
263b	(11.74b)
264	= *11.75**
265b	cf. 4.97b
266a	cf. 1.428a
269b	(12.180b)
270b	4.357b
	(4.226b, 378b)
271a	cf. 4.235a
	cf. 12.796a
	(8.15a)
272	*4.232*
	cf. 6.405a
[273]	= *4.233*
274a	(4.234a)
276b	(G 4.444b)
	(9.319b, 1.614b, 9.5b)
277	*9.657*
278	= *9.658*
280	= *12.868*
	2.774b
	3.48b
283a	(4.534a, 12.486a)
285	= *8.20*

Aeneid, Book 4

	(10.680, 5.701-702)
286	= *8.21*
	(4.630, 11.550-51)
288	= *12.561*
	1.510
	(1.222, 612)
296a	(4.1a, 504a, 12.54a)
296b	cf. 4.85
300a-301b	(4.666b, 7.377b)
303b	cf. G 3.43b
304	cf. 1.581
	cf. 5.708
304b	6.499b
308	G 3.263*
	cf. E 5.20b
	(12.55b)
310b	cf. 3.374b
314	(12.56)
316	cf. 12.42
331	(10.689)
333a	(8.154a, 10.17a)
340	cf. 2.641
343b	cf. 2.56b
345-46	(4.376-77)
347a	(7.122a)
347b	cf. 1.298b
356a	cf. 3.359a
	cf. 4.378a
356b	cf. 4.377b
357b	4.270b
	(4.226b, 378b)
361	(4.381a)
371	(8.84b, 10.685b)
372b	9.209b
374b	cf. 12.145b
376b-77a	(4.345-46)
377b	cf. 4.356b
378a	cf. 4.346a
	cf. 3.359a
378b	(4.226b, 357b, 270b)
379b-80a	cf. 11.253b-54a
380b	(12.644b)
381a	(4.361)
390b-91a	2.790-91a
	cf. 10.554b-55a
	(G 4.501b-502a, 7.449)

391b-92a	(8.584)
393a	cf. 1.305a
	cf. 6.9a
	cf. 6.232a
	cf. 12.311a
393	cf. 11.2a
	cf. 12.746
395	cf. 5.869
	(G 3.226a, A 1.465a)
	(12.886a)
397a	cf. 9.73a
398b	(8.91a + 93b)
401b	cf. 4.592b
402	(G 1.185*)
402a + 403a	(12.715a + 716a)
403	(G 4.156)
412b	3.56b
413b	cf. 4.113b
417a	cf. 2.799a
	(5.293a, 9.720a)
418	= *G 1.304*
419b	(2.3b)
425b	cf. 9.137b
429	(4.435, 6.466)
435	(4.429)
437a	cf. 6.124a
	cf. 10.96a
438a	(12.866a)
441a	(2.626a)
443a	(2.628a)
444	(2.629)
445b	G 2.291b
445b-46a	cf. 6.761b-62a
446	= *G 2.292*
449a	(G 2.294-95, 7.314, 10.696)
	(1.257, 3.477, 7.586)
450a	cf. 7.376a
	(4.571)
451a	(5.617a)
451b	cf. 7.543b
454a	cf. 8.565a
457b	cf. 6.69b
	(G 3.13)
460a	cf. 6.557a
	cf. 7.15a
464a	cf. 6.285a
	cf. 7.183a

Aeneid, Book 4

	cf. 11.78a
468b	3.4b
471b	cf. 3.331b
477b	(1.209a)
481b	(1.741b, 6.796b, 8.136b)
482	= *6.797*
	11.202b
483b	(4.498b)
491b	cf. E 6.71b
498b	(4.483b)
504a	(4.1a, 296a, 12.54a)
508b	(5.284, 618, 10.247, 11.154)
522	(3.147a, 8.26-27)
523b-24a	(7.6b-7.7a)
525b	G 3.243b
527b	cf. 7.87b
[528]	*9.225*
532a	(7.461a)
532b	8.19b
	cf. 4.564b
	(12.486, 527)
533b	cf. 1.50b
	(6.185b)
534a	(4.283a, 12.486a)
542a	G 1.502a
	(8.18, 158, 162, 7.105)
554a	(3.527a, 5.775a, 8.680a)
	(10.261a)
558	*9.650*
559a	(9.651a)
563b	cf. G 4.83b
	(1.657b)
564b	cf. 4.532b
	(8.19b, 12.486, 527)
569a	(9.13a, 12.698)
570b	cf. 10.664b*
571a	cf. 10.647a
571	(4.450)
573b	cf. 3.289b
574b	(7.25, 9.644-45)
575b	(3.667b)
577b	cf. 3.189b
578b	cf. G 2.342b
579b	10.896b
	cf. 10.475
579b-80a	cf. 9.441b-42a

581a	cf. 7.393a*
583	= *3.208*
	(3.290b, 5.778b)
584	= *9.459*
	cf. 12.113b
585	= *G 1.447*
	= *9.460*
586a	(7.511a, 11.877a)
586b	(4.631b)
589	*12.155*
	(G 2.399a)
	(1.94b, 11.877b)
592b	cf. 4.401b
594	cf. 9.37
595b	12.37b
596a	cf. 1.749a
	cf. 4.68a
	cf. 6.456a
599b	cf. 2.596b
603b	cf. 9.41b
611a	(4.652a)
612a	8.574a
622	(8.628*)
630	(4.286, 11.550-51)
631b	(4.586b)
639b	(2.619b)
643	7.399
644	(8.709)
645a	(1.637a, 2.486a)
650	6.231
652a	(4.611a)
653	(10.49, 11.128)
655a	(1.573a)
659b	(2.670b)
660b	(12.952b)
661a	(12.945-46)
663b	cf. 12.138b
665b	(8.595)
666b	cf. 12.608b
	(4.173, 300-301, 7.377)
	(9.473-74, 10.41)
667b	9.477b
	(2.488a)
668	cf. 5.228b
	cf. 12.607
	(2.487)
673	= *12.871*
	11.86

Aeneid, Book 4

682b	cf. 9.192b
689	4.67
	cf. 1.36b
	(7.457b)
694b	(5.606a, 9.2a)
701	*5.89*
	(5.609)
702	cf. 3.194
	cf. 5.10
705b	(5.526-27)

Book 5

8	3.192
9b	cf. 3.193b
10	*3.194*
	cf. 4.702
11	= *3.195*
14b	cf. 5.303b
	cf. 5.400b
15b	cf. 8.108b
	cf. 10.294b
16b	cf. 3.485b
	cf. 5.79b
	cf. 5.464b
	cf. 5.532b
	cf. 7.330b
	cf. 8.559b
	cf. 12.228b
	(9.280, 11.501)
17a	cf. 1.260a
	cf. 9.204a
22b	cf. 12.677b
	(4.109b, 8.15b, 10.49b)
26a	cf. 5.685a
	cf. 9.255a
	cf. 10.783a
	cf. 12.175a
	(1.378a)
	(1.305a, 4.393a, 6.9a, 232a)
	(12.311a)
32a	(5.315a, 1.81a, 8.175a)
	(2.790a, 6.628a, 7.323a)
	(7.471a, 8.541a, 10.633a)
	(12.81a, 441a)
32b-33a	(3.683b)
34a	cf. 3.638a
37b	8.368b
41b	cf. 5.770b
42a	(7.148a)
42b	(3.521b)
43a	(7.149a)
44a	(10.511a, 896a)
45b	cf. 4.230b
	cf. 6.500b
	(6.125b)
47b	(5.55b)
54b	cf. 11.50b
55b	(5.47b)
56a	(G 1.415a, A 1.335, 5.399a)
56b	cf. 2.777b
	cf. 6.368b
	(2.336b)
58a	(3.114a)
59a	(3.115a)
64	cf. 11.182*
65a	(11.182-83)
65b	*4.119*
68	9.178
	(9.572, 10.754)
71b	(7.135b, 8.286b)
72b	G 1.28b
74b	cf. 7.614b
75b	cf. 5.289b
76b	2.40b
	2.370b
	cf. 1.497b
	cf. 4.136b
79b	cf. 3.485b
	cf. 5.16b
	cf. 5.464b
	cf. 5.532b
	cf. 7.330b
	cf. 8.559b
	cf. 12.228b
	(9.280, 11.501)
80	(G 2.173)
82b + 83b	(2.781b + 82b, 3.500)
89	*4.701*
90	(2.212*)
96b	cf. 4.57b
	cf. 6.39b
	cf. 8.544b

Aeneid, Book 5

97b	6.243b
	(6.38-39)
99a	cf. 8.156
101	(8.284)
102a	cf. 1.213a
102b	cf. 1.214b
	cf. 9.164b
	(G 2.527b)
102b-103a	cf. 7.109b-110a
111b	cf. 3.288b
118b	5.223b
128b	(G 4.421)
131	3.430*
133	(12.126)
136b	(5.829b)
137b-38a	*G 3.105b-106a*
138	(6.823)
140a	(G 3.110a)
	(3.207b, 548a, G 4.548a)
	(5.749a, 6.177a)
	(7.156a, 11.713a)
140b-41	(3.127-28)
143	= *8.690**
144	G 3.103
145	= *G 3.104*
146-47	(G 3.106-107)
147b	(10.586)
149a	cf. 8.305a*
149b	(1.725b)
150b	cf. 8.216b
157a	(10.195)
158	10.197
159	cf. 2.730
	cf. 9.371
	cf. 11.621
160a	(9.372)
162b	cf. 11.855b
166a	(11.855a)
170a	(5.217a)
177b	cf. 3.532b
179a	(5.409a, 704a, 6.304a)
	(7.46a, 736a, 11.122a)
189b	cf. 3.560b
199b	cf. 5.432b*
	cf. 9.814b*
214b	cf. 12.587b
215b	(2.498a)
215b	cf. 5.505b*
217a	(5.170a)
219b	(12.369b)
223b	5.118b
226	9.744
228b	cf. 4.668b
	(12.607b)
230b	cf. 12.49b
234b	cf. 7.471b
	(5.514b, 12.780b)
235a	cf. 2.352a
	cf. 6.264a
236b	cf. 3.21b
236-37a	(9.627-28a)
237b	(5.775b)
238	*5.776*
239b-40a	(5.823-24)
240b	cf. 5.825b
241-43	(7.618-21)
242-43	(10.246-48)
243b	cf. 8.66b
244a	cf. 5.424a
	cf. 7.152a
255	9.564
	cf. 12.250
259-60a	*3.467*
	7.639b-40a
267	*9.263*
	cf. 9.357
268a	(2.567a, 5.864a, 8.585a)
	(11.487a)
269	cf. 8.286*
277b	cf. G 3.421*
278a	(11.755a)
284b	(4.508b, 5.618b)
	(10.247a, 11.154a)
286b	cf. 12.553b
287b-88a	(8.598b + 99b)
289b	cf. 5.75b
292	5.486*
293a	cf. 9.720a
	cf. 9.779a
	(2.799a, 4.417a)
296b	(3.327b)
301b	cf. 5.573b
303b	cf. 5.14b
	cf. 5.400b

Aeneid, Book 5

304a	cf. 3.250a
	cf. 10.104a
304b	cf. 8.440b
313	(12.274)
313b	cf. 4.139b
315a	(1.81a, 5.32a, 8.175a)
	(2.790a, 6.628a, 7.323a)
	(7.471a, 8.541a, 10.633a)
	(12.81a, 441a)
316	(6.634)
329a	cf. G 3.498a
348a	cf. 5.461a
	cf. 8.115a
	cf. 11.904a
	(1.580a, 699a, 5.545a, 700a)
	(8.606a, 11.184a, 12.697a)
350	(2.93)
351b	cf. 7.666b
368a	(5.458a, 12.553a)
	(G 3.110a)
372b	cf. 3.427b
	cf. 8.330b
374b	cf. 9.589b
382b	(10.480a, 11.822a, 12.295a)
383a	(1.582a, 615a, 2.289a)
	(3.374a, 435a, 4.560a)
	(5.383a, 474a, 709a)
	(8.59a)
385b-86a	*1.559b-60a*
	cf. 2.58b-59a
	(10.96, 11.132)
389b	(2.348b)
396a	cf. 5.475b
397a	10.613a
399a	(G 1.415a, A 1.335, 5.56a)
400b	cf. 5.14b
	cf. 5.303b
404a	cf. 2.120a
	cf. 8.530a
	cf. 9.123a
408b	cf. 11.753b
409a	(5.179a, 704a, 6.304a)
	(7.46a, 736a, 11.122a)
409	cf. 5.482
420a	(1.463a)
424a	cf. 5.244a

	cf. 7.152a
432a	(12.905a)
432b	9.814b
	cf. 5.199*
433	(G 3.220, 12.720)
434-36	(12.713-14)
441b	11.766b
451a	(9.664a, 11.192a)
454b	(12.108b)
455b	cf. 12.668b
456b	(12.501*)
458a	cf. G 3.110a
	cf. 12.553a
458b	9.669b
	(10.803)
461a	cf. 5.348a
	cf. 8.115a
	cf. 11.904a
	(1.580a, 699a, 11.184a)
	(5.545a, 700a, 8.606a)
	(12.697a)
464b	cf. 3.358b
	cf. 3.485b
	cf. 5.16b
	cf. 5.79b
	cf. 5.532b
	cf. 7.330b
	cf. 8.559b
	cf. 12.228b
	(9.280, 11.501)
465	E 6.47
	cf. E 2.69
	cf. G 4.488b
	(9.601b)
474a	(1.582a, 615a, 2.289a)
	(3.311a, 374a, 435a, 4.560a)
	(5.383a, 709a, 8.59a)
475b	cf. 5.396b
	cf. 12.221b
477a	cf. 12.266a
479b	cf. 4.61b
	cf. 6.245b
482	5.780
	cf. 5.409
	cf. 7.292b
	cf. 8.70
486	5.292*
489b	(5.511b)

Aeneid, Book 5

491b	cf. 10.266b
494b	cf. 5.774b
496b	cf. 12.290b
501a	cf. 12.552a
502b	cf. 7.531b
504a	cf. 9.412a*
505b	cf. 5.215b*
508a	(G 1.142a)
511b	(5.489b)
512b	cf. 12.256b
514b	cf. 7.471b
	cf. 12.780b
	(5.234b)
526a	(2.697a)
526b	cf. 2.791b
526b-27	(4.705b)
529a	(7.814a)
532b	cf. 3.485b
	cf. 5.16b
	cf. 5.79b
	cf. 5.464b
	cf. 7.330b
	cf. 8.559b
	cf. 12.228b
	(9.280, 11.501)
536b	(5.565b)
538	*5.572*
542b	(7.141b, 8.423b)
545a	cf. 5.700a
	cf. 12.697a
	(1.580a, 699a, 11.184a)
	(5.348a, 461a, 8.155a)
	(8.606a, 11.904a)
548a	(3.462a, 4.223a)
553b	cf. G 4.477b
	cf. 6.308b
	(2.531b, 5.576b)
554b	cf. 9.308b
557b	12.489b
	cf. 1.313
	cf. 12.165
565b	(5.536b)
565b-66a	*9.49-50*
570b	9.293b
	(7.107b, 9.310b)
572	*5.538*

573b	cf. 5.301b
576b	(5.553b)
578a	cf. 11.190a
584b-85a	8.448b-49a
585b	(5.674b)
591b	(6.27b)
596	cf. G 4.86
597	(1.271)
600-601	(7.602-603)
606	= *9.2*
	cf. 3.380b
	cf. 9.745b
	cf. 9.802b
	cf. 10.760b
	cf. 12.156b
	(4.694b, 701)
609	(4.701)
612	2.28
617a	(4.451a)
617b	cf. G 2.343b
	cf. 5.769b
	cf. 6.437b
	cf. 12.177b
618b	(4.508, 5.284, 10.247)
	(11.154)
624b	cf. 1.95b
	(3.322, 10.469)
626	(1.755-56)
629a	(6.61)
630	(1.570)
632b	cf. 1.378b
634	cf. 10.60b
	(6.87)
638a	(3.97a, 7.122a, 8.39a)
639b	cf. E 5.65b
640b	cf. 9.764b
	(6.302b, 10.218b)
657	9.14
658	= *9.15*
660b	cf. 2.297b
670b	cf. 8.113b
	cf. 9.781b
673	(G 1.496b)
674b	(5.585b)
685a	cf. 1.378a
	cf. 5.26a
	cf. 9.255a
	cf. 10.783a

Aeneid, Book 5

	cf. 12.175a
	(1.305a, 4.393a)
	(6.9a, 232a, 12.311a)
686b	(2.688b)
687a	cf. 2.689a
	cf. 4.206a
	cf. 9.625a
694a	(7.377a)
700a	cf. 5.545a
	cf. 12.697a
	(1.580a, 699a, 11.184a)
	(5.348a, 461a, 8.155a)
	(8.606a, 11.904a)
700b	6.475
701-702	(4.285-86, 8.20-21)
	(10.680)
704a	(5.179a, 409a, 6.304a)
	(7.46a, 736a, 11.122a)
708	cf. 4.304
709a	(1.582a, 615a, 2.289a)
	(3.311a, 374a, 435a)
	(4.560a, 5.383a, 474a)
	(8.59a)
719a	(12.238)
724b	cf. 6.608b
	cf. 6.661b
725b	3.182b
726a	(5.747a, 784a)
729b	cf. 2.348b
738a	(G 4.497a)
	(2.789a, 11.827a)
738b	(2.8, 3.198, 5.835)
739b	G 1.250b
740	cf. G 4.499*
	(2.791)
743b	8.410b
744	9.259
	(8.543*)
747a	(5.726a, 784a)
748b	1.582b
	9.191b
749a	(G 4.548a)
	(A 3.207b, 548a, 5.140a)
	(6.177a, 7.156a, 11.713a)
755a	cf. 10.287a
	cf. 12.384a

764b	cf. 3.70b*
766b	(8.94b)
	(G 3.341a, 6.127a, 9.488b)
769b	cf. G 2.343b
	cf. 5.617b
	cf. 6.437b
	cf. 12.177b
	(3.160)
770a	cf. 11.106a
770b	8.126
	10.591
	cf. 5.41b
	cf. 10.466
771a	cf. 7.366a
774	*G 3.21*
	cf. 5.494b
	(5.309)
775b	(5.237b)
776	*5.238*
777	= *3.130*
778	= *3.290*
	(3.208b, 4.583b)
780	5.482
	cf. 7.292b
781a	(1.4b, 130)
784a	(5.726a, 747a)
787a	(7.244a)
796a	(G 2.346a, G 4.51a)
	(9.157a, 11.15a)
802b	cf. 7.301b
	cf. 10.695b
809b	(10.357b, 431b)
	(12.218b, 230b)
816b	(1.153b, 197)
817a	(1.155-56)
817b-18a	(4.135b)
818b	12.499b
819	(G 3.194-95)
	(1.147, 7.808)
820-21	(1.142-43)
821a	(8.89a)
822a	(G 1.145a, 181a, 383a)
	(G 1.506a, G 4.406a)
823	(G 1.437)
823-24	(5.239b-40a)
824b	cf. 2.415b
	cf. 11.171b
	cf. 11.598b

Aeneid, Book 5

825b	cf. 5.240b
826	[= *G 4.338*]
	(10.225b)
828	(1.502)
829b	(5.136b)
832b	(5.843b)
833b	cf. 6.337b
835	(2.8, 3.198, 5.738)
836b	(4.5, 8.30)
843b	(5.832b)
852a	cf. 9.431a
856b	cf. G 4.496b
	cf. 10.418b
864a	(2.567a, 5.268a)
	(8.585a, 11.487a)
865b	(12.36b)
869	cf. 4.395
	(G 3.226a)
	(1.465a, 12.886a, 6.332a)

Book 6

2	3.131
	cf. 3.569b
4b	cf. 2.399b
	cf. 3.71b
7a	(G 1.135)
9a	cf. 1.305a
	cf. 4.393a
	cf. 6.232a
	cf. 12.311a
	(1.378a, 5.26a, 685a)
	(10.783a, 12.175a)
19a	(1.301a)
20b	(7.595)
22a	cf. 2.214a
27b	(5.591b)
35b	10.537b
39b	cf. 4.57b
	cf. 8.544b
	cf. 5.96b*
54-55a	2.120-21a
	12.447-48a
56	cf. 1.597
61	(5.629)

64a	cf. G 1.21a
64b-65a	cf. 2.325b-26a*
65	cf. 11.158
67b	cf. 8.10b
69b	cf. 4.457b
	(G 3.13)
76a	(3.457a)
77b	cf. 6.418b
80a	(6.102)
80b	(7.41b)
87	(11.393-94, 12.35-36)
88a	(5.634, 10.60)
88b	(2.27b)
91b	(8.365)
93a	cf. 11.480a
	(10.510)
95b	(9.291b)
101	9.718
102	11.300
	(6.80, 7.451)
118b	6.564b
123a	(6.601a)
123b	cf. 1.380b
124	*4.219*
	cf. 4.437a
	cf. 10.96a
125a	cf. 6.562a
125b	(5.45b)
126a	cf. 10.250a
127a	(G 3.341a)
	(5.766b, 8.94b, 9.488b)
133a	(2.10a, 11.323a, 357a)
133b	cf. 7.263b
135	2.776
140a	(3.255a)
157b-58a	cf. 10.159b-60a
160b	(8.309b)
162b	cf. 3.510b
	cf. 6.212b
164b	(G 2.127b)
	(9.772b, 12.245b)
169a	cf. 1.494
173b	cf. G 3.391b
175	cf. 11.132
176a	1.220a
177a	cf. 7.156a
	(G 4.548a, A 3.207b)
	(3.548a, 5.140a, 749a)

Aeneid, Book 6

	(11.713a)
178b	cf. 2.186b
179-82	(11.135-38)
184a	cf. 11.521a
184b	cf. 9.74b
185	cf. 8.522
	(1.50b, 4.533b)
186	(9.403)
190a	cf. 1.586a
	cf. 2.323a
	cf. 2.692a
	cf. 3.90a
	cf. 3.655a
	cf. 8.520a
	cf. 12.650a
193	10.874
197a	(8.531)
197b	cf. 6.331b
212a	cf. G 2.429a
	cf. G 3.311a
	cf. 1.633a
	cf. 7.572a
	cf. 12.107a
	(G 1.392a, A 3.482a)
	(6.475a, 8.465a, 10.812b)
	(11.203a, 12.481a, 746a)
212b	cf. 6.162b
214b	cf. 11.553b
217b	cf. 2.749b
	cf. 6.861b
	cf. 10.550b
	cf. 11.188b
	cf. 12.275b
218	(7.462-64)
226	(2.431)
231	4.650
232	cf. 7.29
	(2.431)
232a	cf. 1.305a
	cf. 4.393a
	cf. 6.9a
	cf. 12.311a
	(1.378a, 5.26a, 685a)
	(10.783a, 12.175a)
235	(6.381)
243a	cf. 3.537a
243b	5.97b
245b	cf. 4.61b
	cf. 5.479b
247a	(6.506b)
247b	cf. 7.140b
264a	cf. 2.352a
	cf. 5.235a
268	(2.420*)
	(6.452-53)
	(E 9.44)
273	2.469
275b	G 3.67b
279	cf. 6.636
285a	cf. 4.464a
	cf. 7.183a
	cf. 11.78a
288a	cf. 9.632a
290	cf. 3.259
294b	cf. 9.411b*
302	10.218
	(5.640b, 9.764b)
304a	(5.179a, 409a, 704a)
	(7.46a, 736a, 11.122a)
306	= *G 4.475*
307	= *G 4.476*
	2.238b
308	= *G 4.477*
	cf. 5.553b
	(2.531, 1.95)
308b-309a	cf. G 4.472b-73a
321b	cf. 6.628b
331b	cf. 6.197b
332	(4.395, 5.869)
334	(1.113)
335b	cf. G 1.206b
	cf. A 1.376b
	(3.325b, 6.692b, 7.228b)
337b	cf. 5.833b
342b	(6.348b)
348b	(6.342b)
364	10.524
368b	cf. 2.777b
	cf. 5.56b
	(2.336b)
373b	cf. G 1.37b
	cf. 6.721b
	(9.185b)
374b	cf. G 3.37b

Aeneid, Book 6

380	(E 5.42)
381	(6.235)
384a	cf. 8.90a
387b	9.127b
	[10.278b]
	(10.830b)
392a	cf. 6.801a
399b	cf. 11.408b
403a	cf. 7.221a
	cf. 1.596a
403b	(1.10, 1.545, 6.769)
405a	cf. 4.272a
	(4.232a)
405b	cf. 9.294b
	cf. 10.824b
409b	cf. E 1.29b
	cf. E 1.67b
413a	cf. 8.367a
418b	cf. 6.77b
424a	6.635a
427b	cf. 2.485b
	cf. 11.423b
429	= *11.28*
437b	cf. G 2.343b
	cf. 5.617b
	cf. 5.769b
	cf. 12.177b
	(8.380)
438b	G 4.479b
439	= *G 4.480*
452-53	(2.420, 6.268)
456a	cf. 1.749a
	cf. 4.68a
	cf. 4.596a
456b	cf. 3.310b
461a	(2.788a, 7.239a)
461b	(12.881b)
462b	cf. 4.26b
463a	7.240a
465b	6.698b
466	(4.429)
469	*1.482*
	(11.480)
475a	cf. 8.465a
	cf. 12.746a
	(12.481a)
	(G 1.392a, G 2.429a)
	(G 3.311a)
	(1.633a, 6.212a, 7.572a)
	(10.812b, 11.203a)
	(12.107a, 3.482a)
475b	5.700b
476	(3.130, 12.72-73)
477b	cf. 2.209b
482b	cf. 6.754b
483b	cf. 12.363b
486	G 1.235
	(1.611b, 6.656b)
487a	cf. 9.140a
488b	cf. 1.414b
490	(2.749b, 6.861b, 217b)
	(10.550, 11.6, 188, 12.275)
491	cf. 2.685a
499b	4.304b
500b	4.230b
	cf. 1.235b
	cf. 5.45b
506	10.873
	(3.68, 6.247a, 12.638b)
525a	cf. 7.168b
538b	cf. 6.666b
539a	(8.369a, 2.250b)
541b	cf. 12.579b
542a	(9.321a)
547a	cf. 10.256a
	cf. 10.877a
	(12.885a)
547b	cf. 3.669b
557a	7.15a
	cf. 4.460a
559b	(11.699b)
560a	cf. G 1.506a
562a	cf. 6.125a
564b	6.118b
574a	cf. 2.27a
579	cf. 11.867
580a	cf. 6.648a
591	(7.779)
592a	(G 2.325a)
	(A 1.60a, 4.25a)
	(7.141a, 770a, 8.398a)
	(10.100a, 12.178a)
592b	cf. G 1.445b
601a	(6.123a)

Aeneid, Book 6

608b	cf. 5.724b
	cf. 6.661b
623b	(1.651b)
625	= *G 2.43*
626a	(G 2.44a)
628a	cf. 2.790a
	cf. 7.323a
	cf. 7.471a
	cf. 8.541a
	cf. 10.633a
	cf. 12.81a
	cf. 12.441a
	(1.81a, 5.32a, 315a, 8.175a)
628b	cf. 6.321b
630a	cf. 9.221a
633b	(2.725b)
634	(5.316)
635a	6.424a
636b	cf. 6.279b
638a	cf. 1.365a*
645b	(12.169b)
648a	cf. 6.580a
648 + 650	(12.127 + 128)
652	(12.130)
656b	cf. 1.611b
	(G 1.235b, 6.486b)
660	*7.182*
661b	cf. 5.724b
	cf. 6.608b
666b	cf. 6.538b
673a	(8.38a)
679a	cf. 2.687a
	(3.525a, 539a, 558a)
	(6.713a, 854a, 867a)
680	6.758*
687	(2.283)
689b	1.409b*
692b	(G 1.206b, A 1.376b)
	(3.325b, 6.335b, 7.228b)
697b	(1.408b)
698b	6.465b
700	= *2.792*
	(10.685a)
701	= *2.793*
702	= *2.794*
703b	cf. 8.609b

704b	cf. 12.522b
711b	cf. 2.123b
713a	cf. 3.525a
	cf. 6.867a
	(2.687a, 6.679a)
	(3.539a, 558a, 6.854a)
714b	cf. 3.389b
	cf. 10.833b
721b	cf. G 1.37b
	cf. 6.373b
	(9.185b)
728	cf. 8.27
738	(G 1.477, G 4.309)
	(1.354, 7.89, 10.822)
741b	(1.118, 3.197, 421)
752	6.897
	cf. 6.888
753b	cf. 12.248b
754b	cf. 6.482b
756	(G 4.149, A 7.37)
758	6.680*
759a	cf. 3.379a
	(G 4.150a, G 4.286a)
	(7.40a)
759b	(12.111a)
761b-62a	cf. G 2.291b-92a
	cf. A 4.445b-46a
764b	cf. 7.314b
	cf. 12.17b
	cf. 12.937b
	(12.80b)
769b	(1.10, 545, 6.403b)
783	*G 2.535*
796b	(4.481b)
797	= *4.482*
	11.202b
801a	cf. 6.392a
806b	cf. 10.468b
807b	cf. 1.541b
	cf. 1.629b
	cf. 10.75b
809b	cf. G 3.311b
814a	cf. 9.462a
821b	(8.648b)
823	(5.138)
828b	(7.771b)
853	(1.523, 5.731, 12.236)
854a	(3.525a, 6.713a, 867a)

Aeneid, Book 6

	(2.687a, 6.679a)
	(3.539a, 558a)
856b	cf. 1.501b
857b	cf. 9.397b
860a	cf. 7.29a
	cf. 10.873a
861	= *12.275*
	cf. 2.749b
	cf. 6.217b
	cf. 10.550b
	cf. 11.188b
	(6.490b, 11.6b)
866	2.360b
867a	cf. 3.525a
	cf. 6.713a
	(2.687a, 6.679a)
	(3.539a, 558a, 6.854a)
867b	(3.492b, 4.30b, 11.41b)
875b	cf. 11.331b
882a	(10.825, 11.42)
888	cf. 6.752
889a	cf. 4.197a
891	12.137
892	*3.459*
893a	cf. 7.607a
897	6.752
898a	(9.310a)
899	8.546
	(2.795, 4.396, 12.368)
901	= *3.277*

Book 7

1a	(G 3.1a)
9b	(8.22)
13b	(G 2.432b)
14	G 1.294
15a	6.557a
	cf. 4.460a
17a	(11.198a, 12.170a)
19b	cf. 12.402b
23	3.683
25a	cf. 3.521a*
25b	(4.574b, 9.644b-45a)
29a	cf. 6.860a
	cf. 6.232a
	cf. 10.873a
30b	8.31b
35b	cf. G 4.117b
37	(G 4.149, 6.756)
40a	(6.759a, 3.379a)
	(G 4.150a, G 4.286a)
41b	(6.86b)
43a	cf. 11.450a
44b	cf. E 4.5b
46a	(5.179a, 409a, 704a)
	(6.304a, 7.736a, 11.122a)
46b	8.325b
55b	4.141b
56b	(2.783b, 11.371b)
59	cf. 2.508
60b	2.715b
	cf. G 2.208b
	cf. 2.363b
	(9.84b)
64b	cf. G 2.30b
	cf. G 3.275b
	cf. A 1.439b
	cf. A 2.174b
	cf. A 4.182b
	cf. A 8.252b
72	11.479
76b	(7.457a)
78b	cf. 10.637b
87b	cf. 4.527b
89	(G 1.477)
	(G 4.309, A 1.354)
	(6.738, 10.822)
95	(3.40)
98b-99a	= *7.271b-72a*
104b	(4.173b, 666b)
107b	cf. 9.310b
	(5.570b, 9.393b)
109b-110a	cf. 5.102b-103a
122a	(3.97a, 5.638a, 8.39a)
	(4.347a)
123	(1.262)
125b	(3.257b)
135b	(5.71b, 8.286b)
140b	cf. 6.247b
141a	(G 2.325a, A 1.60a)
	(4.25a, 6.592a, 7.770a)
	(10.100a, 8.398a, 12.178a)

Aeneid, Book 7

	(8.423a)
141b	(5.542b)
143a	(7.621a)
146a	cf. 8.283a
147	_1.724_*
148	*4.6*
	(5.42a, 12.113a)
149a	(5.43a, 12.114a)
152a	cf. 5.244a, 424a
153a	cf. 11.331a
156a	cf. 6.177a
	(G 4.548a, A 3.207b)
	(3.548a, 5.140a, 749a)
	(11.713a)
159b	cf. 1.112
161b	cf. 9.371b
168b	cf. 6.525a
172b	(2.715a, 8.598a)
180b	(12.198b)
182	*6.660*
183a	cf. 4.464a
	cf. 6.285a
	cf. 11.78a
187a	cf. 7.612a*
189a	(7.651a, 691, 9.523)
	(12.128, 12.550)
194b	cf. 11.251b
	(1.520-21)
199b	cf. 3.708b
205a	(1.619a*, 8.157)
207b	cf. 9.10b
209	7.255
212b	(1.406b, 9.17b)
219	cf. E 3.60
220b	cf. 10.350b
221a	cf. 1.596a
	cf. 6.403a
221b	cf. 3.155
228b	cf. G 1.206
	(1.376b, 3.325b)
	(6.335b, 692b)
238b	cf. 8.13b
239a	(6.461a)
240a	6.463a
240b	cf. 3.167b
242b	(7.797b)

243-44	(1.647*, 5.787)
244a	(5.787a)
249-50	(1.495)
254b	cf. 12.831b
255	7.209
256b	cf. 7.578b
263a	(1.575-76)
263b	cf. 6.133b
267b	11.176b
271b-72a	= *7.98b-99a*
276b	cf. 11.79b
281b	cf. G 2.140b
287a	(4.91a, 7.308a)
292a	(12.894a)
292b	cf. 5.482b
	cf. 5.780b
293	cf. 1.239*
294b	cf. 1.97b
301b	cf. 5.802b
	cf. 10.695b
308a	(1.46-47, 4.91a, 7.287a)
314a	(1.257b, 3.447a, 4.449a)
	(10.696a, G 2.294a)
314b	cf. 6.764b
	cf. 12.17b
	cf. 12.937b
	(12.80b)
319a	(4.166b)
319-21	(10.704-705)
322b	(10.58b)
323a	cf. 2.790a
	cf. 6.628a
	cf. 7.471a
	cf. 8.541a
	cf. 10.633a
	cf. 12.81a
	cf. 12.441a
	(1.81a, 5.32a, 315a, 8.175a)
324b	cf. 7.454b
326a	cf. 12.336a
330b	cf. 3.485b
	cf. 5.16b
	cf. 5.79b
	cf. 5.464b
	cf. 5.532b
	cf. 8.559b
	cf. 12.228b
	(9.280, 11.501)

Aeneid, Book 7

331b	(12.860a)
337a	(11.143a)
338b-39a	(1.69-70)
344b	cf. 11.217b
346	(G 4.482, 7.450b)
354a	(G 2.362a)
355b	1.660b
366a	cf. 5.771a
376a	cf. 4.450a
377a	(5.694a)
377b	(4.300b, 666b)
378	(2.416)
381b	(2.307b, 10.249b)
383b	(4.149b, 8.414b)
384b	cf. 1.263b
392a	(3.121a, 8.554a, 11.139a)
392	(12.946b)
393a	cf. 4.581a*
396b	cf. G 4.342b
399	4.643
402b	(1.261b, 662b)
404b	3.646b
408	(8.369)
421	8.378
431b	(8.93b)
432b	cf. 7.556b
	cf. 11.231b
	cf. 12.657b
433	cf. 12.568
	(3.189)
435	cf. 11.123*
438b	(1.443b, 4.114b, 10.62b)
440	7.452
	cf. 8.508
442	7.453
444	(7.455)
445a	(11.376a)
446b	cf. 11.424b
	(G 4.190b)
449	(G 4.501b-502a)
	(2.790-91, 4.390-91)
450	(7.346b, 2.203-204)
	(8.289, 697)
451	cf. 2.593
	(6.80a, 102b)
452	7.440

453	7.442
454b	cf. 7.324b
455	(7.444)
457a	(7.76b)
457b	(4.67, 689)
459	cf. 3.175
	(9.812b)
460a	(3.307a, 2.314a)
	(11.453)
460b	(7.625b)
461a	(4.532a)
462-64	(6.218)
464-66	(12.588-92)
467	cf. 11.17
471a	cf. 2.790a
	cf. 6.628a
	cf. 7.323a
	cf. 8.541a
	cf. 10.633a
	cf. 12.81a
	cf. 12.441a
	(1.81a, 5.32a, 315a)
471b	cf. 5.234b
	cf. 5.514b
	cf. 12.780b
477a	(1.657a)
481b-82a	cf. 4.169b-70a
	(6.93, 11.361, 480)
492	(G 4.132-33)
496b	(9.197b)
	(G 3.112, 5.394, 6.823)
502b	cf. 2.679b
509b	(12.457b)
511a	(4.586a, 11.877a)
512b	cf. G 1.402b
	(4.186b)
520b	(11.545b, 610b)
524	11.894*
525	(12.282b, 695b)
526	(12.663)
526b+527b	(8.593)
528	*G 3.237*
529-30	(G 3.238-41)
530	(2.419)
531a	cf. 9.595a
	(7.673)
531b	cf. 5.502b
536b-37	2.426b-27*

Aeneid, Book 7

537b	(1.343b, 9.360b, 10.563b)
540	9.1
543b	cf. 4.451b
546b	(4.112b, 8.56b, 12.822b)
547	cf. 10.105
548b	4.125b
553b	(12.890b)
556b	cf. 7.432b
	cf. 11.231b
	cf. 12.657b
558	2.779
	10.437
559b	cf. G 3.452b
563a	(1.530a, 3.163a)
	(11.522a)
565b-66a	_11.523b-24a_*
568a	(1.534a, 11.526a)
572a	cf. G 2.429a
	cf. G 3.311a
	cf. 1.633a
	cf. 6.212a
	cf. 12.107a
	(G 1.392a, A 3.482a)
	(6.475a, 8.465a, 10.812b)
	(11.203a, 12.481a, 746a)
578b	cf. 7.256b
	(11.322b)
582a	cf. 2.414a
583	(12.804)
586	(10.693a + 696a)
	(4.449a, 7.314a)
591	3.670
599b	cf. 11.461b
602-603	(5.600-601)
603b	(12.103b, 735b)
607a	cf. 6.893a
	(1.294a)
608-611	(1.293-95)
612a	cf. 7.187a*
614b	cf. 5.74b
618-21	(5.241-43)
619b	cf. 2.621b
622b	cf. 10.659b
625b	(7.460b)
639b-40a	3.467
	5.259b-60a

641	= *10.163*
645	[= *9.529*]
648	8.7
649-50a	*9.179-80a*
651a	(7.189a, 691)
	(9.523, 12.128, 550)
666b	cf. 5.351b
667b	cf. 11.681b
668b	(1.631-32, 11.447b)
671b	cf. 3.133b
673	(7.531, 9.595)
688a	(1.313a, 12.165a)
691	= *9.523*
	12.128
	12.550a
	cf. 10.353b
	(7.189, 691)
693	1.722
694b	cf. 10.396b
699a	(7.378a)
703	cf. 9.463
707a	(7.804a, 8.683a)
716b	(10.4b)
722	12.445
722a	(G 4.49-50, 7.807a)
736a	(5.179a, 409a, 704a)
	(6.304a, 7.46a, 11.122a)
737b	(1.622b, 1.236b)
748b	cf. 9.612b
749	*9.613*
753	cf. G 4.31
	(G 3.545)
760a	(8.296a)
762	(9.583)
763	cf. 9.584
764	9.585
768a	(9.124a)
770a	cf. G 2.325a
	cf. 10.100a
	(1.60a, 4.25a, 6.592a)
	(7.141a, 8.398a, 12.178a)
770b	(12.592)
771b	(6.828b)
779	(6.591)
782b	cf. 9.182b
783a	cf. 2.479a
	cf. 12.579a
783b	cf. G 4.538b

Aeneid, Book 7

	cf. G 4.550b
	cf. A 1.71b
	cf. A 8.207b
784	11.683*
	[9.29]
	(8.299a)
795a	cf. 10.353a
797b	(7.242b)
801b	cf. 2.120b
	cf. 12.447b
803b	cf. 11.432b
804	= *11.433*
	cf. 8.593b
	(7.707a, 8.683a)
805a	(1.493a)
805b	(8.409b)
806b	(1.493b)
807a	(7.722a)
807b	cf. 12.345b
808b	(5.819)
814a	(5.529a)

Book 8

4a	11.451a
	cf. 11.618a
7	7.648
9b	cf. 11.226b
10b	cf. 6.67b
11b	cf. 1.68b
13b	cf. 7.238b
14a	(8.322-23)
15a	(4.235a, 271a, 12.796a)
15b	cf. 4.109b
	cf. 10.49b
	(5.22b, 12.677b)
18b	(G 1.502, 3.248, 4.542)
	(7.105, 8.158, 162)
19b	4.532b
	(4.564b, 12.486, 527)
20	= *4.285*
	(10.680, 5.701-702)
21	= *4.286*
	(4.630, 11.550-51)
22	(7.9b)
24a	(2.698)
24b-25a	cf. 3.422b-23a
	(3.575)
26a	3.147a*
	(4.522*)
27	cf. 6.728
28b	cf. 2.512b
29	cf. 11.470
30a	(8.83a)
30b	cf. 1.691b
	(4.5b, 5.836b, 8.406b)
31b	7.30b
32a	cf. 10.190a
33a	(2.773a, 3.150a)
33b	(12.885b)
35	= *2.775*
	= *3.153*
39a	(8.65a)
	(3.97, 5.638, 6.673, 7.122)
40b	(1.130b)
42a	(1.390a)
43	= *3.390*
44	= *3.391*
45	= *3.392*
[46]	= *3.393*
47b	(2.14b)
48	(5.597)
49b	4.115b
50b	4.116b
	11.315
56b	(4.112b, 7.546b, 12.822b)
57	(G 4.401 + 403)
59a	(3.169a, 10.241a)
59	(1.582a, 615a, 2.289a)
	(3.311a, 374a, 435a, 4.560a)
	(5.383a, 474a, 709a)
60a	(3.438a)
61	3.439
63-64	(8.712-13)
65a	(8.39a)
66b	cf. 5.243b
	(12.886b)
70	5.482
71-72	(G 2.147, 9.816)
	(12.198 + 200)
78b	(12.188b)
80	3.471*
80b-81a	cf. 3.317b-18a

Aeneid, Book 8

81b	G 4.554b
	2.680b
	cf. 3.26b
	cf. 9.120b
	cf. 10.637b
83a	(8.30a)
84a	cf. 11.170a
84b	(10.685b, 4.371b)
89a	(5.821a)
90a	cf. 6.384a
91-93	(4.398)
93a	(8.539a)
93b	(7.431b)
94b	(5.766b)
	(G 3.341a, 6.127a, 9.488b)
97	G 4.426
98b-99a	(12.132)
103b	cf. 3.19b
104a	cf. 3.302a
106a	(1.507)
108b	cf. 5.15b
113b	cf. 5.670b
	cf. 9.781b
115a	cf. 5.348a
	cf. 5.461a
	cf. 11.904a
	(1.580a, 699a, 11.184a)
	(5.545a, 700a, 12.697a)
	(8.606a)
121a	(1.613a, 9.197)
124b	(8.558b-59a)
126	5.770
	10.466
	10.591
	cf. 1.663
	cf. 2.147
128b	cf. 11.332b
136b	(1.741b, 4.481b)
141b	(1.103b, 2.222b, 12.795b)
149	G 2.158
152a	cf. 10.530a
	cf. 11.120a
154	(4.333a, 10.17a)
155a	cf. 12.260a
	(6.693a)
156	cf. 5.99a

157a	(1.619, 7.205)
158a	cf. 8.162a
	(G 1.502a, A 3.248a)
	(4.542a, 7.105b, 8.18a)
162a	cf. 8.158a
	(G 1.502a, A 3.248a)
	(4.542a, 7.105b, 8.18a)
163b	cf. 11.782b
163b-64a	3.298b-99a
	cf. 2.280a
164b	cf. 1.514b
171	*1.571*
173b	cf. 1.735
175a	(1.81a, 5.32, 315)
	(2.790, 6.628, 7.323)
	(7.471, 8.541, 10.633)
	(12.81, 441)
182	1.699
	cf. 1.467b
	cf. 2.63b
	cf.4.162b
	cf. 8.545b
184a	cf. 1.216a
	(1.723a)
207	G 4.538
	G 4.550
	cf. A 1.71b
	cf. A 7.783b
208	(G 4.539, 551)
216b	cf. 5.150b
221b	(11.513b)
223b	(12.733b)
230a	cf. 3.664a
	cf. 10.718a
247a	cf. 3.278a
250b-51a	cf. 12.751b-52a
252b	cf. G 2.30b
	cf. G 3.275b
	cf. A 1.439b
	cf. A 2.174b
	cf. A 4.182b
	cf. A 7.64b
269b	cf. 8.281b
271b	cf. 8.272b
272b	cf. 8.271b
273a	(1.627a)
280b	cf. E 6.86b
	(A 1.374b)

Aeneid, Book 8

281b	cf. 8.269b
283a	cf. 7.146a
284a	(5.101)
284b	12.215b
285b	cf. E 8.74b
	cf. A 2.515b
	cf. A 4.145b
286	cf. 5.269*
	(5.71b, 7.135b)
289	(8.697, 2.203-204)
	(7.346, 450, G 4.482)
296a	(7.760a)
299a	(7.784a)
299b	(11.27b)
302b	(10.255b)
305	cf. 5.149a*
309b	(6.160b)
310a	(8.618-19)
312b	(3.102b, 8.356b)
322-23	(8.14)
324-25	(6.792-93a)
325b	7.46b
329b	cf. G 2.173b
330b	cf. 3.427b
	cf. 5.372b
334b	cf. G 2.491b
	cf. A 2.324b
	(10.467b)
336b	(4.376b, 12.405b)
356	3.102
	(8.312b)
359a	12.212
360	cf. 3.220
365	(6.91b)
366b	cf. 2.302b
367a	cf. 6.413a
368b	5.37b
369a	(2.250a, 6.539a)
369b	(2.253, 7.408)
377b	(10.607b)
378	7.421
380	(6.437)
388-89	(4.66, G 3.271)
390	12.66
	(G 3.272, A 2.120, 11.296)
	(12.447)

394a	(8.115a)
395b	cf. 9.126b
	cf. 10.276b
398a	(G 2.325a)
	(1.60a, 4.25a, 7.141a)
	(7.770a, 10.100a, 12.178a)
405	(8.615)
405-406	(1.685-91)
405b	(4.5b, 8.30b)
407a	(3.69a)
	(1.723a, 2.268a)
410b	5.743b
	(8.542-43)
414a	(2.382a, 3.236a, 4.447a)
	(11.456a, 814a, 12.9)
	(12.124a)
414-15	(3.513, 4.149, 7.383)
421b	cf. G 4.263b
423	(5.542, 7.141)
424b	cf. 3.617b
440b	cf. 5.304b
441a	(1.1a)
442b	(12.427b)
443a	cf. 12.699a
448b-49	5.584b-85a
449b	G 4.171b
450	= *G 4.172*
451	= *G 4.173*
	(G 2.450)
452	*G 4.174*
	12.720
	cf. 10.146
	(G 3.220)
453	*G 4.175*
	cf. 12.404
465a	cf. 6.475a
	cf. 12.746a
	(12.481a)
	(G 1.392a, G 2.429a)
	(G 3.311a, A 1.633a)
	(3.482a, 6.212a, 7.572a)
	(10.812b, 11.203, 12.107a)
470a	(8.513)
478a	(8.603a, 642a)
482b	cf. 10.768b
491b	cf. 9.568b
497b	cf. 3.135b
499b	cf. 4.130b

Aeneid, Book 8

	cf. 9.226b
	(8.606b)
501b	cf. 10.714b
	cf. 10.742b
508	cf. 7.440
513	(8.470)
520a	cf. 1.586a
	cf. 2.323a
	cf. 2.692a
	cf. 3.90a
	cf. 3.655a
	cf. 6.190a
	cf. 12.650a
520b	cf. 2.1b
	(11.121b)
521	8.586
	12.384b
521a	(5.407a, 6.127, 348)
	(10.250, 822)
522	cf. 6.185
525	cf. 3.90
	(1.586, 2.466)
528b	(9.630b)
530a	cf. 2.120a
	cf. 5.404a
	cf. 9.123a
531a	(1.406, 6.193, 9.16)
531b	cf. 11.45b
	cf. 11.152b
538b	(1.100b)
539	*1.101*
	cf. 12.328
	(8.93a)
541a	cf. 2.790a
	cf. 6.628a
	cf. 7.323a
	cf. 7.471a
	cf. 10.633a
	cf. 12.81a
	cf. 12.441a
	(1.81a, 5.32a, 315a)
541b	(11.301)
542-43	(8.410b)
543	(G 2.514, 5.744)
544b	4.57b
	cf. 6.39b

	cf. 5.96b
545b	cf. 1.467b
	cf. 1.699b
	cf. 2.63b
	cf. 4.162b
	cf. 8.182b
546	6.899
549b	G 3.447b
553b	(5.352b)
554a	(3.121, 4.184, 7.392)
554	(12.608)
557	(2.773)
559b	cf. 3.485b
	cf. 5.16b
	cf. 5.79b
	cf. 5.464b
	cf. 5.532b
	cf. 7.330b
	cf. 12.228b
	(9.280, 11.501)
563	12.14
	cf. 11.397b
565a	cf. 4.454a
574a	4.612a
579b	9.497b
581b	(3.660, 9.482)
582b	(11.772b)
584	(4.391)
585	(9.25)
585a	(2.567a, 5.268a, 864a)
	(11.487a)
586	8.521
	12.384b
588b	(12.281)
589b	(2.801)
593b	cf. 7.804b
	cf. 11.433b
	(7.526-27)
594b	(3.714b)
595a	(4.665, 11.878)
595b-96a	cf. 1.82b-83a
	(G 2.280b)
596	*11.875*
598a	cf. 2.715a
	(7.172b)
598b-99	(5.287-88)
603a	(8.478a, 642a)
606a	(1.580a, 3.343a, 11.184a)

Aeneid, Book 8

	(12.440a, 1.699)
	(5.348, 461, 8.115)
	(5.545, 700, 12.697)
	(8.606, 11.904)
606b	(4.130b, 8.499b, 9.226b)
609a	(1.679a, 11.479a)
609b	cf. 6.703b
611b	(1.314)
615	(8.405)
617b	cf. 3.178b
627a	(4.65a)
628a	cf. 8.710a
628b	(4.622*)
642a	(8.478a, 603a)
647	cf. 3.52
648b	(6.821b)
667	*G 4.467*
668a	cf. 11.258
674	(7.34)
679	3.12
680a	cf. 3.527a
	cf. 10.261a
	(4.554a, 5.775a, 12.564)
683a	(7.707a, 804a, 11.433a)
	(12.457a)
690	= *5.143**
694b	4.71b
697	(2.203-204, 8.289)
709	(4.644)
710a	cf. 8.628a
712-13a	(8.63-64a)
730	(10.666)

Book 9

1	7.540
2	= *5.606*
	cf. 3.380b
	cf. 9.745a
	cf. 9.802a
	cf. 10.760a
	cf. 12.156a
5	(G 4.444, 1.614)
	(4.276, 9.319)
10b	cf. 7.207b

13a	(G 3.43a, A 4.569a)
14	5.657
15	= *5.658*
16a	(1.406a, 8.531)
16b	1.93
16b-17a	2.153
17b	1.406b
	(7.212b)
21b	(12.72-73a)
25	(8.585)
[29]	= *7.784*
	11.683
36b	(11.876)
37	cf. 4.594
38	cf. G 3.43
41b	cf. 4.603b
49b-50a	*5.565b-66a*
53b	G 2.145b
54b	(9.636, 10.799)
57a	(1.1, 119, 9.462)
59-61	(G 3.537-38)
	(9.339-341)
64	(2.357-58)
73a	cf. 4.397a
74b	cf. 6.184b
79	(6.878, 5.688, 3.69)
85b	(G 2.208b, A 2.363, 715)
	(7.60b)
100a	cf. 4.224a
104b	10.113b
105	= *10.114*
106	= *10.115*
110	cf. 9.731
120b	cf. 2.680b
	cf. 8.81b
	cf. 10.637b
[121]	= *10.223*
123a	cf. 2.120a
	cf. 5.404a
	cf. 8.530a
124a	cf. 10.354a
	(7.767)
124b	(10.717)
126b	*10.276b*
	cf. 8.395b
127	[= *10.278*]
	6.387b
131a	cf. 10.121a

Aeneid, Book 9

133b	(12.894)
137b	cf. 4.425b
140a	cf. 6.487a
143b	cf. 3.685b
	(10.511b)
145b	cf. 2.624b
148	cf. 2.198
151	2.166
152b	cf. 2.401b
157a	(G 2.346a, G 4.51a)
	(5.796a, 9.157a, 11.15a)
160b	10.119b*
164b	cf. G 2.527b
	cf. 1.214b
	cf. 5.102b
171b	9.779b
	12.549b
176b	cf. 12.226b
178b	5.68b
	(9.572, 10.754)
179-80a	*7.649-50a*
182b	cf. 7.782b
185b	(G 1.37, A 6.373, 721)
189b	9.236b*
	cf. 2.265b
	(3.630b)
191b	1.582b
	5.748b
192b	cf. 4.682b
196	cf. 2.234
196b	9.241b
197	cf. 8.121
	cf. G 2.476b
	(7.496b)
198b	(9.652)
200b	(1.615)
204a	cf. 1.260a
	cf. 5.17a
209b	4.372b
211b	(12.321b)
221a	cf. 6.630a
224	(3.147)
	(4.522-27)
225	[*4.528*]
226b	cf. 4.130b
	cf. 8.499b

	(8.606b)
229	(12.130)
236b	9.189b*
	cf. 2.265b
	(3.630b)
241b	9.196b
247a	(G 1.498a, A 2.702a)
247b	(2.703b)
252a + 253a	(1.605)
252b	cf. 10.825b
255a	cf. 1.378a
	cf. 5.26a
	cf. 5.685a
	cf. 10.783a
	cf. 12.175a
	(1.305a, 4.393a)
	(6.9a, 232a, 12.311a)
255b	(2.638b)
259	5.744
263	*5.267*
	cf. 9.357
266b	cf. 1.446b
	cf. 1.613b
	cf. 11.74b
272b-73a	(12.270-71)
280b	(11.501, 3.485b)
	(5.16b, 79b, 464b, 532b)
	(7.330b, 8.559b, 12.228b)
284b	cf. 10.388b
291b	(6.95b)
293b	5.570b
	(9.310, 7.107)
294	10.824
	cf. 6.405
297a	(E 1.7a)
303a	cf. 11.29a
308b	cf. 5.554b
310a	(6.898a)
310b	cf. 7.107b
	(5.570b, 9.293b)
314b	cf. G 1.366
316	(9.189b, 236b)
319	(G 4.444, A 4.276)
	(1.614)
321a	(6.542a)
332	12.382
336a	cf. 9.583a
339-41	(9.59-60)

Aeneid, Book 9

339a	(10.723a)
340a	10.724a
341a	(12.718)
341b	cf. 12.8b
	(1.296)
344-46	(G 2.456-57)
347-48	(12.950)
355b	cf. 12.150b
356	(G 2.398)
357	cf. 5.267
	cf. 9.263
360b	(7.537)
367b	cf. 11.100b
371a	cf. 2.730a
	cf. 5.159a
	cf. 11.621a
371b	cf. 7.161b
377a	cf. 1.370a
378	(1.357)
380a	(1.162a, 500a, 12.431a)
385b	cf. 2.737b
	cf. 11.530b
388	(6.179, 10.723)
392b-93a	*2.753b-54a*
393b	(2.755b)
397b	cf. 6.857b
399a	(G 4.504a)
400b	cf. 9.554b*
401	11.647
	G 4.218
402	11.561
403b	cf. 11.784b
	(6.186)
410	10.127
411b	cf. 6.294b*
412a	cf. 5.504a
418a	(4.120, 12.737)
422b	(11.592, 720)
429b	(3.599)
431a	cf. 5.852a
432	12.508
	cf. 12.276a
441b-42a	cf. 4.579b-80a
451b	cf. 11.99b
459	= *4.584*
460	= *4.585*

	= *G 1.447*
462a	cf. 6.814a
	(1.1, 1.119, 9.57)
463	cf. 7.703
464b	12.590b
	(12.228)
466b	cf. 9.636b
	cf. 10.799b
472b	cf. 3.626b
473-74	(4.666)
475b	cf. 3.308b
	(3.57, 11.819)
477b	4.667b
481-84	(12.57-58)
	(4.678-84)
482a	(8.581)
487b	(4.683-84)
492b	cf. 10.162b
497b	8.579b
501b	cf. 3.348a
518b	(2.335b)
523	= *7.691*
	12.128
	cf. 12.550b
	cf. 10.353b
527	9.785
	(2.398)
[529]	= *7.645*
532b	(12.552b)
541b	cf. 12.757b
547b-48a	(11.710b-11a)
549	cf. 12.469
549b	cf. 10.761b
554b	cf. 9.400b*
	(2.511b)
564	5.255
	(12.250)
568b	cf. 8.491b
569	10.698
	(12.531)
572	10.754
	(5.68, 9.178)
578b	12.319b
583a	cf. 9.336a
583b	(7.762)
584	cf. 7.763
585	7.764
586	cf. 10.762

Aeneid, Book 9

587b	11.579b
	(G 2.392)
589b	cf. 5.374b
595a	cf. 7.531
	(7.673)
599a	cf. 9.635a
601b	(E 2.69, E 6.47)
	(G 4.488, A 5.465)
607	*G 2.472*
612b	cf. 7.748b
613	*7.749*
625a	cf. 2.689a
	cf. 4.206a
	cf. 5.687a
625b	G 1.40b
627a	(5.236b)
628a	(5.237a)
629	= *E 3.87*
630	(8.528)
631a	cf. 2.693a
631b	(10.169b)
632a	cf. 6.288a
633b	(9.808b, 10.891)
635a	cf. 9.599a
636b	cf. 9.466b
	cf. 10.799b
	(9.54b)
637b	cf. 10.262b, 11.37b
640b	9.652b
644b-45a	(4.574b, 7.25b)
647b	cf. 1.617b
648a	cf. 11.32a
649	(11.33)
650	*4.558*
651a	(4.559a)
652	9.640b
	(9.198, 1.663, 8.126)
	(10.466, 591)
657	*4.277*
658	= *4.278*
663	cf. 11.360
664a	(5.451a, 11.192a)
667b	cf. 11.635b
	(12.124b-25a)
669b	5.458b
	(10.803b)
670a	(5.459a, 10.804a)
701a	(12.372b)
703b	cf. 12.371b
708b	cf. 9.734b
718	6.101
720b	cf. 5.293a
	(2.799a, 4.417a)
726	(10.146, 12.73)
730b	cf. 4.158b
731	cf. 9.110
733	(2.734)
734b	cf. 9.708b
737b	cf. 11.369b
740a	cf. 1.254a
	cf. 12.829a
	(12.18)
744	5.226
745b	cf. 3.380b
	cf. 5.606b
	cf. 9.2b
	cf. 9.802b
	cf. 10.760b
	cf. 12.156b
749b	(12.729b*)
763b	12.330b
764b	cf. 5.640b
	(6.302, 10.218)
772b	(G 2.127, A 12.245)
	(6.164)
773b	cf. 10.140b
777b	(1.1)
779a	cf. 5.293a
779b	9.171b
	12.549b
781b	cf. 5.670b
	cf. 8.113b
785b	9.527
	(2.398, 10.662b)
792a	(2.315a*)
794a	G 3.149, 12.398
801b	cf. 10.410b
802b	cf. 3.380b
	cf. 5.606b
	cf. 9.2b
	cf. 9.745b
	cf. 10.760b
	cf. 12.156b
803-804a	(4.694, 9.2)

Aeneid, Book 9

804	cf. G 3.41b
	(12.25)
808b	(9.633, 10.891)
812b	3.175
	(7.459b)
814b	5.432b
	cf. 5.199b*
817b	(3.215)

Book 10

1	12.791
2b	1.65b
	2.648b
	10.743b
4b	(7.716)
12b	cf. G 2.172b*
	(A 4.234b)
14-15	(4.622-24)
17a	(4.333a, 8.154a)
18b	(10.100b)
21b-22a	(11.899, 12.497)
23b	(G 2.282, G 3.220)
	(12.628)
24	*11.382*
25a	10.85a
30a	(1.250)
30b	(11.175)
38b	(9.18, 10.73b)
41b	(4.666b, 4.300-301)
43a	cf. 3.16a
46b	cf. 12.844
49	11.128
	(4.653, 5.709)
49b	cf. 4.109b
	cf. 8.15b
	(5.22b, 12.677b)
51-52a	10.86
	(1.680b)
52b	(12.397)
58b	(7.322)
60b	cf. 5.634b
	(6.87)
61b	(1.9)
62b	(1.443, 4.114, 7.438)
70a	(12.572)
73b	(10.38b, 9.18)
75b	cf. 1.541b
	cf. 1.629b
	cf. 6.807b
85a	10.25a
86	10.51-52a
96a	cf. 4.437a
	cf. 6.124a
96b	(1.559, 5.385)
100a	cf. G 2.325a
	cf. 7.770a
	(1.60a, 4.25a, 6.592a)
	(7.141a, 8.398a, 12.178a)
100b	(10.18b)
104	= *3.250*
	cf. 5.304a
105	cf. 7.547
107a	cf. 12.694a
108b	cf. 1.574b*
113a	cf. 3.395a
113b	9.104b
114	= *9.105*
115	= *9.106*
119b	9.160b*
	(1.673b)
121a	cf. 9.131a
122b	11.475b
127b	9.410b
132a	(12.579a)
139	(12.542)
140b	cf. 9.773b
146a	cf. 8.452a
	cf. 12.720a
146b	cf. 12.73
	(9.726)
150b	cf. 10.204b
151b	(12.45)
152	cf. 2.75
159b-60a	cf. 6.157b-58a
160a	(12.43a)
162b	cf. 9.492b
	(1.598b)
163	= *7.641*
164a	cf. 11.597a
169b	(9.631b)
182b	cf. G 4.212b
190a	cf. 8.32a

Aeneid, Book 10

191b	cf. E 6.46b
195	(5.157)
197	5.158
204b	cf. 10.150b
214b	(1.35b)
217a	cf. 1.643a
217b	4.5b
218	6.302
	(5.640, 9.764)
223	[= *9.121*]
225a	(1.72a)
236a	cf. 1.267a
	cf. 4.156a
237a	cf. E 10.45a
241a	(3.169a, 8.59a)
245	10.509
246-48	(5.239-43)
247a	(4.508, 5.284, 618, 11.154)
248	(10.754)
249b	(2.307, 7.381)
250a	cf. 6.126a
	(5.407, 6.348, 8.521)
	(10.822)
255b	(8.302)
256a	cf. 6.547a
	cf. 10.877a
260a	cf. 2.21a
261a	cf. 3.527a
	cf. 8.680a
	(4.554a)
262b	11.878b
	cf. 9.637b
	cf. 11.37b
	(1.103, 2.222, 8.141)
	(12.795)
263a	(3.94a)
266b	cf. 5.491b
269b	cf. 3.157b
	(4.313b, 582b)
274b	cf. G 1.237b
	cf. A 2.268b
	cf. A 12.850b
	(G 3.66b)
275	G 3.279
276b	*9.126b*
	cf. 8.395b
[278]	= *9.127*
	6.387b
287a	cf. 5.755a
	cf. 12.384a
294b	cf. 5.15b
313a	(10.343a)
314	(12.87)
326b	cf. 1.350b
335b	(12.93b)
336	(10.777*)
343a	(10.313a)
349b	cf. G 3.516b
350b	cf. 7.220b
353a	cf. 7.795a
353b	cf. 7.691b
	cf. 9.523b
	cf. 12.128b
354a	cf. 9.124a
357b	cf. 10.431b
	(5.809b, 12.218b)
361b	(10.734b, 11.632b)
362a	(1.474)
388b	cf. 9.284b
396b	cf. 7.694b
401b	(12.93)
410b	cf. 9.801b
412b	(12.491)
418b	cf. 5.856b
421b	cf. 10.773b
431b	cf. 10.357b
	(5.809b, 12.218b)
437	7.558
	cf. 2.779
452	G 2.484
454b	(3.239)
455b	cf. 12.103b
456b	(10.656b)
459b	cf. 11.556b
460b	(10.516-17)
466	8.126
	cf. 10.591b
	cf. 1.663b
	cf. 2.147b
	cf. 5.770b
	(9.652b)
467b	cf. G 3.284b
	cf. 2.324b
	(8.334b)

Aeneid, Book 10

468b	cf. 6.806b
469b	1.95b
	3.322b
	(5.624b)
475	cf. 10.896b
	cf. 4.579b
480b	(5.382, 11.822, 12.295)
488b	cf. 2.243b
489b	(12.8b)
509	10.245
510a	(6.93a, 11.480a)
511a	(5.44a, 10.896a)
511b	(3.685b, 9.143b)
516-17	(10.460b)
520-21a	cf. 11.82b-83a*
524	6.364
525b	cf. 11.178b
530a	cf. 8.152a
	cf. 11.120a
533b	cf. 11.177b
535a	(2.552)
536b	cf. 2.553b
537b	6.35b
538b	3.81b
	(G 1.349b)
550b	cf. 2.749b
	cf. 6.217b
	cf. 6.681b
	cf. 11.188b
	cf. 12.275b
	(6.490, 11.6)
554b-55a	cf. 4.390-91
	(G 4.490-500)
556b	11.685
	cf. 2.107b
563b	cf. 1.343b
	(7.537)
564a	(7.536, 537)
586	(5.147)
587a	(10.595a)
591b	8.126b
	cf. 1.663b
	cf. 10.466b
	(5.770b, 9.652b)
595a	(10.587a)
597	1.606
606a	cf. 12.791a
607b	(8.377b, 10.611b)
611b	(10.607b)
613a	5.397a
617b	cf. 11.592b
627b	(10.643b, 11.49b)
633a	cf. 2.790a
	cf. 6.628a
	cf. 7.323a
	cf. 7.471a
	cf. 8.541a
	cf. 12.81a
	cf. 12.441a
	(1.81, 5.32, 315, 8.175)
637b	cf. 2.680b
	cf. 7.78b
	cf. 8.81b
	cf. 9.120b
645	10.776*
647a	cf. 4.571a
651a	cf. 2.679a
656b	(10.456b)
659b	cf. 7.622b
662	(9.785, 12.328, 11.197)
664b	cf. 4.570b*
666a	(8.730)
667	1.93
675	(12.637)
675b-76a	12.883b-84a
	(4.24)
680	(4.285, 8.20, 5.701-702)
685a	(4.690, 6.700, 2.792)
685b	(4.371b, 8.84b)
689a	(4.331a)
693a	(7.586a)
695b	cf. 5.802b
	cf. 7.301b
696a	(4.449, 7.314, 1.257)
	(4.331, 7.586)
698	9.569
	cf. 12.531
704b-705	(7.319-20)
707b	cf. G 4.112b
	cf. 12.523b
714b	cf. 8.501b
	cf. 10.742b
717b	(9.124b)
718a	cf. 3.664a

Aeneid, Book 10

	cf. 8.230a
723a	(9.339a, 6.179, 9.388)
724a	9.340a
730a	cf. 10.781a
742b	cf. 8.501b
	cf. 10.714b
743a	(2.550a)
743b	1.65b
	2.648b
	10.2b
745	= _12.309_
746	_12.310_
754	(10.248)
754b	9.572b
	(5.68, 9.178)
760b	cf. 3.380b
	cf. 5.606b
	cf. 9.2b
	cf. 9.745b
	cf. 9.802b
	cf. 12.156b
761a	cf. G 3.552a
761b	cf. 9.549b
762	cf. 9.586
767	= _4.177_
768b	cf. 8.482b
773b	cf. 10.421b
776	10.645*
777	(10.336*)
781a	cf. 10.730a
783a	cf. 1.378a
	cf. 5.26a
	cf. 5.685a
	cf. 9.255a
	cf. 12.175a
	(1.305, 4.393, 6.9, 232)
	(12.311)
789b	cf. 1.716b
796b	cf. G 4.245b
	cf. 11.815b
797b	cf. 12.299b
799a	cf. 9.466b
	cf. 9.636b
	(9.54b)
803b	(5.458, 9.669)
804a	(9.670a)

812b	(G 1.392a, G 2.429a)
	(G3.311a,A1.633a,6.212a)
	(6.475a, 7.572a, 8.465a)
	(10.812a, 11.203a)
	(12.107a, 481a, 746a)
822a	(5.407, 6.126, 348)
	(8.521, 10.250)
822	G 1.477b
	cf. A 1.354
	(G 4.309, 6.738, 7.89)
824	9.294
	cf. 6.405b
	(2.560)
825a	(6.882, 11.42)
825b	cf. 9.252b
830b	(6.387b)
833b	cf. 3.389b
	cf. 6.714b
836b	(12.78b)
839a	cf. 1.750a
842	_12.640_
844	(12.611)
852	11.539
870b	(12.666b)
871	= _12.667_
[872]	= _12.668_
873a	cf. 6.860a
	cf. 7.29a
873b	6.506b
874	6.193
877a	cf. 6.547a
	cf. 10.256a
	(12.885a)
890a	cf. 3.34a
891a	(9.633, 808)
893b	cf. 12.301b
896a	(5.44a, 10.511a)
896b	4.579b
	cf. 10.475b
905	cf. 12.680

Book 11

1	= _4.129_
2a	cf. 4.393
	cf. 12.746
4b	cf. 3.588b

Aeneid, Book 11

6	(6.490, 861, 12.275)
15a	(G 2.346a, G 4.51a)
	(5.796a, 9.157a)
17	cf. 7.467
27b	(8.299b)
28	= _6.429_
29a	cf. 9.303a
32a	cf. 9.648a
33	(9.649)
35	_3.65_*
37a	cf. 1.485a
37b	cf. 9.637b
	cf. 10.262b
	(1.103, 2.222, 8.141)
	(12.795)
41b	(3.492, 4.30, 6.867)
42a	(6.882, 10.825)
45	11.152
	cf. 8.531b
46a	(11.152)
50b	cf. 5.54b
52b	(11.61b, 76b)
61b	(11.52b, 76b)
72b	(1.648, 4.134)
74b	cf. 1.466b
	cf. 1.613b
	cf. 9.266b
75	= _4.264_*
76b	(11.52b, 61b)
78a	cf. 4.464a
	cf. 6.285a
	cf. 7.183a
79b	cf. 7.276b
82b-83a	cf. 10.520b-21a*
86	4.673
	12.871
89a	(G 2.145)
93	12.281
	cf. 11.835
95a	cf. 12.491a
99b	cf. 9.451b
100b	cf. 9.367b
106a	cf. 5.770a
107b	cf. 2.593b
	cf. 12.358b
113	cf. 3.235

115b	cf. 2.127b
117b	cf. G 1.489b
120a	cf. 8.152a
	cf. 10.530a
121b	(2.1b, 8.520b)
122a	(5.179a, 704a, 6.304a)
	(7.46a, 736a)
123	cf. 7.435*
128	10.49
	(4.653)
132b	cf. 6.175
	(1.559b, 5.385b)
135-38	(6.179-82)
139a	(7.392, 8.554, 3.121)
143a	(7.337a)
152	11.45*
	cf. 8.531b
154a	(4.508, 5.284, 618)
	(10.247)
158	cf. 6.65
165a	3.83a
170a	cf. 8.84a
171a	cf. 11.835a
171	11.598
	cf. 2.415b
	cf. 5.824b
175b	(10.30b)
176b	7.267b
177b	cf. 10.533b
178b	cf. 10.525b
182	cf. 5.64*
	cf. G 3.66
	(G 1.237b)
183a	(5.65a)
184a	cf. 1.580a
	cf. 1.699a
	(3.343a, 5.348, 461, 545)
	(5.700, 8.115, 606, 11.904)
	(12.440a, 697)
188b	cf. 2.749b
	cf. 6.217b
	cf. 6.861b
	cf. 10.550b
	cf. 12.275b
190a	cf. 5.578a
192a	(5.451a, 9.664a)
192b	1.87
	2.313

Aeneid, Book 11

197	(10.662)
198a	(7.17a, 12.170)
199a	12.214a
202b	4.82b
	6.797b
203a	(G 1.392a, G 2.429a)
	(G 3.311a, A 1.633a)
	(6.212a, 475a, 7.572a)
	(8.465a, 10.812b)
	(12.107a, 481a, 746a)
210b	cf. 3.589b
	cf. 4.7b
217b	cf. 7.344b
218b	cf. 12.282b
	cf. 12.695b
221	11.434
	cf. 12.467*
226b	cf. 8.9b
231b	cf. 7.432b
	cf. 7.556b
	cf. 12.657b
241b	cf. 1.730b
248	= *1.520*
251	7.194
	(1.521)
252b	cf. E 4.6b
	cf. E 6.41b
253b-54a	cf. 4.379b-80a
258	cf. 8.668a
296b	cf. 2.120b
	cf. 12.447b
	(8.390b, 12.66b)
300	6.102
301b	(8.541)
314b	cf. 2.35b
315	8.50
321b	(7.256, 578)
323a	(2.10, 6.133)
330b	(12.212)
331a	cf. 7.153a
331b	cf. 6.875b
332	cf. G 4.230
	cf. A 8.128b
342b	4.197b
357a	(6.133a)
360	9.663
361	(11.480, 12.600)
	(4.169-70, 7.481-82)
362a	cf. 11.399a
365	(8.145, 382)
365b	cf. 12.653b
369b	cf. 9.737b
371b	(2.783b, 7.56b)
376a	(7.445a)
376b	12.45b
	cf. 12.9b
377	(1.485)
377b	11.840b
	cf. 3.246b
382	*10.24*
389a	cf. 12.461a
397b	cf. 8.563b
	(12.14b)
399a	cf. 11.362a
404	2.197
407a	cf. 2.125a
408b	cf. 6.399b
411b	cf. 2.676b
423b	cf. 2.485b
	cf. 6.427b
424b	cf. 7.446b
	(G 4.190b)
426a	(1.281)
431b	cf. 12.24b
432b	cf. 7.803b
433	= *7.804*
	cf. 8.593b
	(7.707a, 8.683a)
434	11.221
	cf. 12.467
450a	cf. 7.43a
451a	8.4a
	cf. 11.618a
452b	11.728b
453	(7.460)
456a	(2.382a, 3.236a, 4.447a)
	(8.414a, 11.814a, 12.9a)
	(12.124a)
461b	cf. 7.599b
465a	cf. 11.604a
470	cf. 8.29
471	[*12.612*]
472	[*12.613*]
475b	10.122

Aeneid, Book 11

476b	(2.11, 2.668)
477	(1.479)
479a	(1.679a, 8.609a)
479b	7.72b
480a	cf. 6.93a
	(10.510a, 4.169-70a)
	(7.481-82a, 11.361b)
487a	(2.567a, 5.268a, 864a)
	(8.585a)
488b	12.430b
495-97	(G 3.77-81)
498	cf. 11.898
501b	(9.280b, 11.501)
	(3.485b, 5.16b, 79b, 464b)
	(5.532b, 7.330b, 8.559b)
	(12.228b)
513b	(8.221b)
521a	cf. 6.184a
523b-24a	_7.565b-66a_*
530b	2.737b
	cf. 9.385b
537a	(11.586a)
539	10.852
541b	cf. 12.337b
545b	(7.520, 11.610)
550	(2.729)
552a	cf. 12.442a
552b	(12.206b)
553b	cf. 6.214b
556b	cf. 10.459b
561	9.402
579b	9.587b
	(G 2.392)
580a	(G 1.120a)
585	11.842
586a	(11.537a)
591	*11.848*
592b	cf. 10.617b
	(9.422, 11.720)
597a	cf. 10.164a
598	11.171
	cf. 2.415b
	cf. 5.824b
604a	cf. 11.465a
607	11.911
610b	(7.520, 11.545)
617b	cf. 11.795b
618a	cf. 8.4a
	cf. 11.451a
621	2.730
	cf. 5.159a
	cf. 9.371a
631a	cf. 3.37a
631b	cf. 2.397b
632b	(10.361, 734)
635b	cf. 9.667b
638b	cf. 3.619b
647	G 4.218
	9.401
650	(12.489)
652	11.774
657	(12.83)
662a	(1.491a)
663b	1.490b
681b	cf. 7.667b
683	7.784*
	[9.29]
685b	10.556b
	cf. 2.107b
697a	(11.755, 12.902)
699b	(6.559)
704a	(2.62, 4.563, 1.657-58)
710-11	(9.547-48)
713a	(G 4.548a, A 3.207b, 548a)
	(5.140a, 749a, 6.177a)
	(7.156a)
720b	12.949b
	(11.592, 9.422)
725b	1.254b
728	11.452
731a	cf. 12.759a
745a	12.462a
746a	cf. 12.705a
747a	(1.1a)
753b	cf. 5.408b
755a	(5.278a, 11.697a, 12.902)
755b	(3.561a, 12.481a)
766b	5.441b
772b	(9.582b)
774	11.652
780b	(12.598)
782b	cf. 8.163b
784b	cf. 9.403b
795b	cf. 11.617b

Aeneid, Book 11

796b	cf. 11.839b
814a	(2.382a, 3.236a, 4.447a)
	(8.414a, 12.9a, 12.124a)
815b	cf. G 4.245b
	cf. A 10.796b
819b	(3.57, 308, 9.475)
822b	(5.382, 10.480, 12.295)
827a	(G 4.497a, 2.789a, 5.738a)
831	= *12.952*
832b-33a	2.488b
835a	cf. 11.93
	cf. 11.171a
835b	12.551b
839	cf. 11.796b
840	11.377
842	11.585
846a	cf. 2.447a
848	*11.591*
855a	(5.166a)
855b	cf. 5.162b
865a	cf. 1.44a
867	cf. 6.579
869b	(12.661)
875	*8.596*
876	(9.36)
877a	(4.586, 7.511)
877b	(4.589)
878b	10.262b
	(1.103, 2.222, 8.141)
	(11.37, 12.795)
	(G 4.58)
885b	2.411b
887	2.531
	cf. 2.681b
	(1.95)
894	7.524*
898	cf. 11.498
899b	cf. 12.497b
	(10.21)
903a	cf. 1.34a
904a	cf. 5.348a
	cf. 5.461a
	cf. 8.115a
	(1.580a, 1.699a, 11.184a)
	(5.545a, 700a, 12.697a)
	(8.606a)
911	11.607

Book 12

5	(4.1)
8b	cf. 9.341b
	(1.296, 10.489)
9a	(2.382a, 3.236a, 4.447a)
	(8.414a, 11.456a, 814a)
	(12.124a)
9b	(11.376, 12.45)
14	8.563
	(11.397)
15a	(2.557)
17b	cf. 6.764b
	cf. 7.314b
	cf. 12.937b
18	(9.70)
24b	cf. 11.431b
25b	(G 3.41b, 9.804b)
36b	(5.865b)
37b	4.595b
42	cf. 4.316
45b	11.376b
	(12.9b, 10.151)
46a	(2.759)
46b	(1.713)
49b	cf. 5.230b
54a	(4.1a, 4.296a)
55b	(4.308)
56	(4.314)
58a	(9.481-84)
66	8.390
	cf. 11.296b
	(2.120, 12.447)
73	cf. 10.146b
73b	(12.790b)
78b	(10.836)
80	(6.764b, 7.314b, 12.17b)
	(12.937b)
81a	cf. 2.790a
	cf. 6.628a
	cf. 7.323a
	cf. 7.471a
	cf. 8.541a
	cf. 10.633a
	cf. 12.441a
82a	(12.326a)
83	(11.657)
84b	(G 3.193)
87	(10.314)

Aeneid, Book 12

93b	(10.335b)
99-100	(4.215-16)
103b	cf. 10.455b
	cf. 12.735b
104	G 3.232
105	= *G 3.233*
106	*G 3.234*
107a	cf. G 2.429a
	cf. G 3.311a
	cf. 1.633a
	cf. 6.212a
	cf. 7.572a
	(G 1.392a, A 3.482a)
	(6.475a, 8.465a, 10.812b)
	(11.203a, 12.481a, 746a)
107b-108a	cf. 12.938b-39a
108b	(5.454b)
113	cf. 4.584b
	cf. 9.459b
	(7.148)
114a	(7.149a)
116b	cf. G 4.193b
124a	(2.382a, 3.236a, 4.447a)
	(8.414a, 11.814a, 12.9a)
	(11.456a)
125b	cf. 1.491b
126	(1.639, 5.133)
127b	cf. 12.550b
128	*7.691*
	9.523
	12.550a
	cf. 10.353b
130	(6.652, 9.229)
132b	cf. 2.445b
	(7.160b, 8.98-99)
133a	cf. 2.332a
137	6.891
141b	(12.878b)
144a	(12.878a)
145b	cf. 4.374b
150b	cf. 9.355b
155	*4.589*
156b	cf. 3.380b
	cf. 5.606b
	cf. 9.2b
	cf. 9.745b

	cf. 9.802b
	cf. 10.760b
165	= *1.313*
	5.557
	cf. 12.489b
	(7.688a)
169b	(6.645)
170a	(7.17, 11.198)
175a	cf. 1.378a
	cf. 5.26a
	cf. 5.685a
	cf. 9.255a
	cf. 10.783a
	(1.305, 4.393, 6.9, 232)
	(12.311)
177b	cf. G 2.343b
	cf. A 5.617b
	cf. A 5.769b
	cf. A 6.437b
178a	(G 2.325a, A 1.60a, A 4.25a)
	(6.592a, 7.141a, 770a)
	(8.398a, 10.100a)
180	(2.469)
188b	(8.78)
198b	(7.180)
200	(8.72*)
203a	cf. 2.709a*
212	8.359a
	(11.330)
213a	cf. 2.67a
214a	11.199a
215b	8.284b
221b	cf. 5.475b
224a	(12.227a)
226b	cf. 9.176b
227a	(12.224a)
228b	cf. 3.485b
	cf. 5.16b
	cf. 5.79b
	cf. 5.464b
	cf. 5.532b
	cf. 7.330b
	cf. 8.559b
235a	(3.325)
237b	(4.39b)
238	(5.719)
244a	(2.199a*)
245b	G 2.127b

Aeneid, Book 12

	(6.164)
246-50	(1.393-95)
248b	cf. 6.753b
250	cf. 5.255
250b	(5.255)
253a	(1.394a)
256b	cf. 5.512b
257b	cf. 3.524b*
258b	cf. 12.460b
260a	cf. 8.155a
264b	(1.34, 3.191)
266	12.461
	cf. 5.477a
270-71	(9.272-73)
274	(5.313)
275	= *6.861*
	cf. 2.749b
	cf. 6.217b
	cf. 10.550b
	cf. 11.188b
276a	cf. 9.432a
	cf. 12.508a
281b	cf. 11.93b
	(8.588)
282b	cf. 12.695b
	cf. 11.218b
	(7.525)
290b	cf. 5.496b
295b	(5.382, 10.482, 11.822)
299b	cf. 10.797b
301b	cf. 10.893b
309	= *10.745*
310	*10.746*
311a	cf. 1.305a
	cf. 4.393a
	cf. 6.9a
	cf. 6.232a
	(1.378a, 5.26a, 685a)
	(10.783a, 12.175a)
318b	cf. 4.663b
319b	9.578b
321b	(9.211b)
326a	(12.82a)
328	cf. 1.101
	cf. 8.539
	(10.662)

330	9.763
336a	cf. 7.326a
337b	cf. 11.541b
345b	cf. 7.807b
351b	cf. 2.535b
354b	cf. 12.906b
358b	cf. 11.107b
	cf. 2.593b
363b	cf. 6.483b
366b	cf. G 2.108b
	cf. G 3.200b
	cf. 1.86b
368a	12.913a
	(6.899)
369b	(5.219b)
371b	cf. 9.703b
372b	(9.701b)
380a	cf. 12.532a
382	9.332
383b	(8.570-71)
384	8.521
	8.586
384a	cf. 10.287a
	cf. 5.755a
394b	cf. 1.187b
397b	(10.52b)
402b	cf. 7.19b
404	G 4.175
	cf. 8.453b
405b	(8.336b)
409b	cf. 2.338b
416b	cf. 4.137b
425	(1.1a, 119, 9.777)
	(2.668, 6.651, 9.57)
	(11.747)
427b	(8.442b)
430b	11.488b
431a	(1.162, 500, 9.380)
440	*3.343*
	cf. 1.580a
441a	cf. 2.790a
	cf. 6.628a
	cf. 7.323a
	cf. 7.471a
	cf. 8.541a
	cf. 10.633a
	cf. 12.81a
441b	(3.215, 11.462)

Aeneid, Book 12

442a	cf. 11.552a
445	7.722
447b-48a	*2.120b-21a*
	6.54b-55a*
	cf. 7.801b
	(8.390, 11.296*, 12.66)
450	cf. G 2.280
453b	(2.310)
455	cf. G 1.362
457a	(7.707a, 804a)
	(8.683a, 11.433a)
457b	(10.509)
460b	cf. 12.258b
461	12.266
461a	cf. 11.389a
462a	11.745a
463	cf. 4.155a
	(G 4.85)
	(12.738)
467	cf. 11.221*
	cf. 11.434
469	cf. 9.549
476a	cf. 2.761a
481a	(3.561a, 11.755a)
482b	cf. 12.689b
483a	(4.680)
486a	(4.283a)
	(4.534a, 12.637a)
486b	(4.532, 564, 8.19)
	(12.527a)
489b	5.557b
	cf. 1.313b
	cf. 12.165b
	(11.650)
491a	cf. 11.95a
491b	(10.412)
497b	cf. 11.899b
	(10.21)
498b	cf. 12.770b
499b	5.818b
501b	cf. 1.29b
	(5.456b*)
506b	(3.610b)
508a	9.432
	cf. 12.276a
521b	cf. 12.708b

522b	cf. 6.704b
523	(12.305*)
523b	cf. G 4.112b
	cf. 10.707b
527a	(12.486, 4.532)
531b	cf. 9.569b
	cf. 10.698b
532a	cf. 12.380a
542	(10.139)
549b	9.171b
	9.779b
550a	12.128a
	cf. 7.691a
	cf. 9.523a
550b	cf. 12.127b
551b	11.835b
552a	cf. 5.501a
552b	(9.532b)
553a	cf. G 3.110a
	cf. 5.458a
553b	cf. 5.286b
554b	cf. 4.227b
557b	cf. 12.689b
561	= *4.288*
	1.510
	(1.222b)
568b	cf. 7.433b
577b	cf. 2.494b
579a	cf. 2.479a
	cf. 7.783a
	(10.132a)
579b	cf. 6.541b
583b	cf. E 1.71b
587b	cf. 5.214b
590b	9.464b
600	(11.361, 480)
	(4.169-70, 7.481-82)
607	cf. 2.487b
	cf. 4.668
	(5.228)
608b	cf. 4.666b
	(8.554)
611	(10.844)
[612]	= *11.471*
[613]	= *11.472*
620b	cf. 2.298b
623	(12.784)
628a	(11.899a)

Aeneid, Book 12

628b	(G 3.220, 10.23b)
637a	(4.534a, 12.486a)
637	(10.675)
640	*10.842*
644b	(4.380b)
650a	cf. 1.586a
	cf. 2.323a
	cf. 2.692a
	cf. 3.90a
	cf. 3.655a
	cf. 6.190a
	cf. 8.520a
653b	cf. 11.365b
656a	(1.150a)
657b	cf. 7.432b
	cf. 7.556b
	cf. 11.231b
660b	cf. G 3.417b
661b	(11.869b)
663	(7.526)
666b	(10.870b)
667	= *10.871*
668	[= *10.872*]
	cf. 5.455b
670	G 4.451
	4.220
677	(5.709-710)
677a	cf. 5.22b
	(4.109b, 8.15b, 10.49b)
680	cf. 10.905
682a	(2.358a)
683a	(12.711a)
689b	cf. 12.482b
	cf. 12.557b
694a	cf. 10.107a
695b	cf. 11.218b
	cf. 12.282b
	(7.525)
697a	cf. 5.545a
	cf. 5.700a
	(1.580a, 699a)
	(3.343a, 11.184a, 12.440a)
	(5.348a, 461a, 8.115a)
	(8.606a, 11.904a)
699a	cf. 8.443a
705a	cf. 11.746a

708b	cf. 12.521b
711a	(12.683a)
713-14	(5.434-36)
715a	(G 3.219)
715a + 16a	(4.402a + 403a)
716b	cf. 12.812b
717b	cf. G 3.549b
718a	(9.341)
719b	cf. 1.185b
720	G 4.174
	G 3.220
	8.452
	cf. 10.146a
721-22	(G 3.221-23)
728b	cf. 12.920b
729	(9.749*)
733b	(8.223b)
735b	cf. 12.103b
737a	(4.121, 9.418)
746a	cf. 6.475a
	cf. 8.465a
	(12.481a)
	(G 1.392a, G 2.429a)
	(G 3.311a, A 1.633a)
	(3.482a, 6.212a, 7.572a)
	(10.812b, 11.203, 12.107a)
746	cf. 4.393
	cf. 11.2a
750	G 3.372
751b-52a	cf. 8.250b-251a
754	(2.530)
756	cf. 2.313a
757b	cf. 9.541b
759a	cf. 11.731a
776b	G 2.314b
768a	cf. 3.209a
770b	cf. 12.498b*
780b	cf. 5.514b
	cf. 7.471b
	(5.234)
784	(12.623)
790b	(12.73b)
791	10.1
	cf. 10.606a
793a	(1.223a, 241a)
793b	(2.70b)
795	cf. 1.103b
	cf. 2.222b

Aeneid, Book 12

	(8.141, 10.262, 11.37)
	(11.878, 1.258-59)
796a	cf. 4.271a
	cf. 4.235a
	(8.15a)
799b	(2.452b)
801-802	(1.662, 4.66-67)
804	(7.583)
812b	cf. 12.716b
822b	(4.112, 7.546, 8.56)
829a	1.254a
	cf. 9.740a
831b	cf. 7.254b
844b	cf. 10.46
846b	cf. 3.587b
	(G 1.247)
850b	cf. G 1.237b
	cf. A 2.268b
	cf. A 10.274b
	(G 3.66b)
853b-54a	(1.223b)
860a	(7.331)
866a	(4.438a)
867a	(1.92)
868	= *4.280*
	2.774b
	3.48b
871	= *4.673*
	11.86
876a	(G 1.470)
878a	(12.144a)

878b	(12.141b)
881b	(6.461b)
882-83a	(4.317-18)
883b-84a	10.675b-76a
	(4.24b)
885a	(6.547a, 10.877a)
885b	(8.33b)
886a	(1.465, 4.395, 5.869)
	(G 3.226)
886b	(8.66b)
890b	(7.553b)
894a	(7.292)
894b	(9.133)
902a	(11.697a, 755a)
905a	(5.432a)
906b	cf. 12.354b
908a	(2.270a)
913a	12.368a
920b	cf. 12.728b
930b	cf. 12.939b
937b	cf. 6.764b
	cf. 7.314b
	cf. 12.17b
938b-39a	cf. 12.107b-108a
939b	cf. 12.930b
945-46a	(4.661)
946b	(7.392)
949	11.720
	(2.576)
950b	(9.347-48)
951b	cf. 1.92b
952	= *11.831*
	(7.770-71)
	(4.660b)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following abbreviations are used:

AC	*L'Antiquité Classique*
AJP	*American Journal of Philology*
AUMLA	*Journal of the Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association*
CJ	*Classical Journal*
CP	*Classical Philology*
CQ	*Classical Quarterly*
CR	*Classical Review*
CW	*Classical World*
G&R	*Greece and Rome*
GRBS	*Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*
HSCP	*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*
JRS	*Journal of Roman Studies*
MH	*Museum Helveticum*
NJbb	*Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum*
RE	Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie*
RhM	*Rheinisches Museum*
TAPA	*Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*
UCPCP	*University of California Publications in Classical Philology*
WS	*Wiener Studien*
YCS	*Yale Classical Studies*

Albrecht, E., 'Wiederholte Verse und Verstheile bei Vergil'. *Hermes* 16 (1881) 393-444.
Albrecht, M. von, 'Die Kunst der Spiegelung in Vergils Aeneis'. *Hermes* 93 (1965) 54-65.
Allen, T. W., *Homeri Opera.* 5 vols. Oxford, 1912-1920.
Amerasinghe, C. W., '"Saturnia Juno"—Its Significance in the *Aeneid*'. *G&R* 22 (1953) 61-69.
Anderson, W. B., 'Gallus and the Fourth *Georgic*'. *CQ* 27 (1933) 36-45, 73.
Anderson, W. S., 'Vergil's Second *Iliad*'. *TAPA* 88 (1957) 17-30.
——, '*Pastor Aeneas*: On Pastoral Themes in the *Aeneid*'. *TAPA* 99 (1968) 1-17.
Arend, W., *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer.* Problemata 7. Berlin, 1933.
Austin, N., *Archery at the Dark of the Moon.* Berkeley, 1975.
Austin, R. G., 'Virgil and the Sibyl'. *CQ* 21 (1927) 100-105.
——, 'Virgilian Assonance'. *CQ* 23 (1929) 46-55.
——, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus.* Oxford, 1955.
——, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Secundus.* Oxford, 1964.
——, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus.* Oxford, 1971.
——, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Sextus.* Oxford, 1977.
Bacon, J. R., 'Aeneas in Wonderland: A Study of Aeneid VIII'. *CR* 53 (1939) 97-104.
Bailey, C., *Lucreti De Rerum Natura.* 2nd ed. Oxford, 1922.
——, *Religion in Virgil.* Oxford, 1935.
——, *T. Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex.* 3 vols. Oxford, 1947.
Basson, W. P., *Pivotal Catalogues in the Aeneid.* Amsterdam, 1975.
Becker, C., 'Virgils Eklogenbuch'. *Hermes* 83 (1955) 314-349.
Belling, H., *Studien über die Compositionskunst Vergils in der Aeneide.* Leipzig, 1899.
Benario, H. W., 'The Tenth Book of the *Aeneid*'. *TAPA* 98 (1967) 24-36.

Bickel, E., 'Syllabus indiciorum quibus pseudovergiliana et pseudoovidiana carmina definiantur'. *RhM* 93 (1950) 289-324.
Binder, G., *Aeneas und Augustus.* Meisenheim, 1971.
Bömer, F., 'Studien zum VIII. Buche der Aeneis'. *RhM* 92 (1944) 319-69.
——, 'Beiträge zum Verständnis der augusteischen Dichtersprache'. *Gymnasium* 64 (1957) 1-21.
——, *P. Ovidius Naso: Die Fasten.* 2 vols. Heidelberg, 1957-58.
Bowra, C. M., 'Aeneas and the Stoic Ideal'. *G&R* 3 (1933-34) 8-21.
Boyancé, P., *La religion de Virgile.* Paris, 1963.
Boyle, A. J., 'The Meaning of the *Aeneid*: A Critical Inquiry'. *Ramus* 1 (1972) 63-90, 113-151.
——, 'Virgil's Pastoral Echo'. *Ramus* 6 (1977) 121-31.
Brooks, R. A., 'Discolor Aura'. *AJP* 74 (1953) 260-80.
Brown, E. L., *Numeri Vergiliani: Studies in 'Eclogues' and 'Georgics'.* Coll. Latomus 63. Brussels, 1963.
Buchheit, V., *Vergil über die Sendung Roms.* Heidelberg, 1963.
——, 'Tibull II.5 und die Aeneis'. *Philologus* 109 (1965) 104-120.
——, *Der Anspruch des Dichters in Vergils Georgica.* Darmstadt, 1972.
Büchner, K., *Beobachtungen über Vers und Gedankengang bei Lukrez.* Hermes Einzelschriften 1. Berlin, 1936.
——, *Der Schicksalsgedanke bei Vergil.* Freiburg, 1946.
——, 'P. Vergilius Maro'. *RE* 8A (1955) 1021-1486.
Burck, E., 'Das Menschenbild im römischen Epos'. *Gymnasium* 65 (1958) 121-46.
——, Review of W. Richter, *Georgica* (Munich, 1957). *Gnomon* 31 (1959) 224-38.
Calhoun, G. M., 'Homeric Repetitions'. *UCPCP* 12 (1933) 1-25.
Carlsson, G., 'The Hero and Fate in Virgil's *Aeneid*'. *Eranos* 43 (1945) 111-35.
Cartault, A., *L'art de Virgile dans l'Énéide.* 2 vols. Paris, 1926.
Cholmeley, R. J., *The Idylls of Theocritus.* London, 1919.
Christ, W., *Wiederholungen in der Ilias.* Munich, 1879.
Clark, W. P., 'Ancient Reading'. *CJ* 26 (1931) 698-700.
Clarke, M. L., 'Rhetorical Influences in the *Aeneid*'. *G&R* 18 (1949) 14-27.
——, 'The Date of the *Ciris*'. *CP* 68 (1973) 119-21.
Clarke, W. M., 'Intentional Rhyme in Vergil and Ovid'. *TAPA* 103 (1972) 49-77.
Clausen, W., 'An Interpretation of the *Aeneid*'. *HSCP* 68 (1964) 139-47.
——, 'Callimachus and Latin Poetry'. *GRBS* 5 (1964) 182-96.
—— et al., *Appendix Vergiliana.* Oxford, 1966.
Coleman, R., *Vergil: Eclogues.* Cambridge, 1977.
Commager, H. S., 'Lucretius' Interpretation of the Plague'. *HSCP* 62 (1957) 105-118.
Conington, J. and Nettleship, H., *The Works of Virgil.* 3 vols. London, 1883-98 (= Hildesheim, 1963).
Conway, R. S., *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus.* Cambridge, 1935.
Cordier, A., 'De quelques procédés du style épique: à propos d'une thèse sur Virgile'. *Revue de Philologie* 56 (1930) 328-49.
——, *Études sur le vocabulaire épique dans l'Énéide.* Paris, 1939a.
——, *L'allitération latine: Le procédé dans l'Énéide de Virgile.* Paris, 1939b.
D'Alton, J. F., *Roman Literary Theory and Criticism.* London, 1931.
Damon, P., 'Modes of Analogy in Ancient and Medieval Verse'. *UCPCP* 15 (1961) 261-334.
Desport, M., 'L'écho de la nature et la poésie dans les *Églogues* de Virgile'. *Revue des Études Anciennes* 43 (1941) 270-81.
Deubner, L., 'Ein Stilprinzip hellenistischer Dichtkunst'. *NJbb* 47 (1921) 361-78.
Deutsch, R., *The Pattern of Sound in Lucretius.* Bryn Mawr, 1939.
DeWitt, N. W., *The Dido Episode in the Aeneid of Vergil.* Toronto, 1907.

Dimock, G. E., 'From Homer to Novi Pazar and Back'. *Arion* 2/4 (1963) 40-57.
Dover, K. J., *Theocritus: Select Poems*. London, 1971.
Drabkin, I. E., *The Copa*. Geneva, N.Y., 1930.
Duckworth, G. E., *Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius, and Vergil*. Princeton, 1933.
——, 'The Architecture of the *Aeneid*'. *AJP* 75 (1954) 1-15.
——, 'Fate and Free Will in Vergil's *Aeneid*'. *CJ* 51 (1956) 357-64.
——, 'The *Aeneid* as a Trilogy'. *TAPA* 88 (1957) 1-10.
——, 'Vergil's *Georgics* and the *Laudes Galli*'. *AJP* 80 (1959) 225-37.
——, 'The Significance of Nisus and Euryalus in *Aeneid* 9-12'. *AJP* 88 (1967) 129-50.
——, *Vergil and Classical Hexameter Poetry*. Ann Arbor, 1969.
Dunbar, H., *A Complete Concordance to the Odyssey of Homer*. Revised by B. Marzullo. Hildesheim, 1962.
Dunkle, J. R., 'The Hunter and Hunting in the *Aeneid*'. *Ramus* 2 (1973) 127-42.
Eden, P. T., *A Commentary on Virgil Aeneid VIII*. Mnemosyne Supplement 35. Leiden, 1975.
Elder, J. P., 'Lucretius 1.1-49'. *TAPA* 85 (1954) 88-120.
Elderkin, G. W., 'Repetitions in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius'. *AJP* 34 (1913) 198-201.
Enk, P. J., 'La tragédie de Didon'. *Latomus* 16 (1957) 628-42.
Fabiano, G., 'Fluctuations in Theocritus' Style'. *GRBS* 12 (1971) 517-37.
Fenik, B., 'Parallelism of Theme and Imagery in *Aeneid* II and IV'. *AJP* 80 (1959) 1-24.
Fitzgerald, G. J., 'Nisus and Euryalus: A Paradigm of Futile Behaviour and the Tragedy of Youth'. In *Cicero and Virgil: Studies in Honour of Harold Hunt*, edited by J. R. C. Martyn. Amsterdam, 1972. Pp. 114-37.
Forbiger, A., *P. Virgilii Maronis Opera*. 3rd ed. 3 vols. Leipzig, 1852.
Fordyce, C. J., *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Libri VII-VIII*. Oxford, 1977.
Fowler, W. W., *Aeneas at the Site of Rome*. Oxford, 1918.
Fraenkel, E., 'Some Aspects of the Structure of *Aeneid* VII'. *JRS* 35 (1945) 1-14.
——, 'The Culex'. *JRS* 42 (1952) 1-9.
——, '*Vesper Adest*'. *JRS* 45 (1955) 1-8.
——, *Elementi Plautini in Plauto*. Translated by F. Munari. Florence, 1960.
Fränkel, H., *Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica*. Oxford, 1961.
——, *Noten zu den Argonautica des Apollonios*. Munich, 1968.
Frank, T., 'Vergil's Apprenticeship. II'. *CP* 15 (1920) 103-119.
——, *Vergil: A Biography*. New York, 1922.
Friedländer, P., 'The Pattern of Sound and the Atomistic Theory in Lucretius'. *AJP* 62 (1941) 16-34.
Galinsky, G. K., '*Aeneid* V and the *Aeneid*'. *AJP* 89 (1968) 158-85.
Gellie, G. H., 'Juno and Venus in *Aeneid* IV'. In *Cicero and Virgil*, edited by J. R. C. Martyn. Amsterdam, 1972. Pp. 138-48.
Georgii, H., *Die antike Aeneiskritik aus den Scholien und anderen Quellen*. Stuttgart, 1891.
Getty, R. J., 'Roma, Romulus, and Augustus in the Sixth Book of the *Aeneid*'. *CP* 45 (1950) 1-12.
Geymonat, M., *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Turin, 1973.
Gimm, R., *De Vergilii stilo bucolico*. Leipzig, 1910.
Gladow, F., *De Vergilio ipsius imitatore*. Greifswald, 1921.
Goold, G. P., 'Servius and the Helen Episode'. *HSCP* 74 (1970) 101-68.
——, 'The Nature of Homeric Composition'. *Illinois Classical Studies* 2 (1977) 1-34.
Gow, A. S. F., *Bucolici Graeci*. Oxford, 1952.
——, *Theocritus*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Cambridge, 1952.
Gransden, K. W., *Virgil: Aeneid Book VIII*. Cambridge, 1976.
Grassmann-Fischer, B., *Die Prodigien in Vergils Aeneis*. Studia et Testimonia Antiqua 3. Munich, 1966.

Güntzschel, D., *Beiträge zur Datierung des Culex*. Orbis Antiquus 27. Münster, 1972.
Guglielmino, F., *L'iteratio nell'Eneide*. Catania, 1901.
Guillemin, A. M., *Virgile: Poète, Artiste et Penseur*. Paris, 1951.
Hahn, E. A., 'Note on Vergil's Use of *Anchisiades*'. *CW* 14 (1920) 3-4.
Hainsworth, J. B., *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula*. Oxford, 1968.
Halter, T., *Form und Gehalt in Vergils Aeneis*. Munich, 1963.
Hardie, C., *Vitae Vergilianae Antiquae*. Oxford, 1966.
Hardie, W. R., *Res Metrica*. Oxford, 1920.
Hartman, I. I., 'De locorum similium considerandorum ratione'. *Mnemosyne* 49 (1921) 269-85.
Havelock, E. A., *Preface to Plato*. Cambridge, Mass., 1963.
Heinze, R., *Virgils epische Technik*. 3rd ed. Leipzig, 1915 (= Stuttgart, 1965).
Helm, R., 'Ein Epilog zur Cirisfrage'. *Hermes* 72 (1937) 78-103.
Hendrickson, G. L., 'Ancient Reading'. *CJ* 25 (1929) 182-96.
Herescu, N. I., 'Iucunditas in situ'. *AC* 22 (1953) 89-93.
——, *La Poésie Latine*. Paris, 1960.
Heyne, C. G., *P. Virgilii Maronis Opera*. 4th ed. 5 vols. Leipzig, 1830-41.
Highet, G., *The Speeches in Vergil's Aeneid*. Princeton, 1972.
Hirtzel, F. A., *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Oxford, 1900.
Hornsby, R. A., *Patterns of Action in the Aeneid*. Iowa City, 1970.
Hügi, M., *Vergils Aeneis und die hellenistische Dichtung*. Noctes Romanae 4. Berne, 1952.
Ingalls, W. B., 'Repetition in Lucretius'. *Phoenix* 25 (1971) 227-36
Jachmann, G., Review of D. L. Drew, *Culex* (Oxford, 1925). *Gnomon* 4 (1928) 577-83.
Jens, W., 'Der Eingang des dritten Buches der Aeneis'. *Philologus* 97 (1948) 194-97.
Jocelyn, H. D., 'Ancient Scholarship and Virgil's Use of Republican Latin Poetry. I'. *CQ* n.s. 14 (1964) 280-295.
——, 'Ancient Scholarship and Virgil's Use of Republican Latin Poetry. II'. *CQ* n.s. 15 (1965) 126-44.
Johnson, W. R., *Darkness Visible: A Study of Vergil's Aeneid*. Berkeley, 1976.
Johnstone, H. T., 'Rhymes and Assonances in the *Aeneid*'. *CR* 10 (1896) 9-13.
Kirk, G. S., 'Formular Language and Oral Quality'. *YCS* 20 (1966) 155-74.
Klingner, F., *Virgils Georgica*. Zurich, 1963.
——, *Römische Geisteswelt*. 5th ed. Munich, 1965.
——, *Virgil*. Zurich, 1967.
Klotz, A., 'Zur *Ciris*'. *Hermes* 57 (1922) 588-99.
——, 'Zum *Culex*'. *Hermes* 61 (1926) 28-48.
Knauer, G. N., *Die Aeneis und Homer*. Hypomnemata 7. Göttingen, 1964.
Knecht, D., 'Virgile et ses modèles latins'. *AC* 32 (1963) 491-512.
Knight, W. J. F., 'Repetitive Style in Virgil'. *TAPA* 72 (1941) 212-25.
——, 'Pairs of Passages in Virgil'. *G&R* 13 (1944a) 10-14.
——, *Roman Vergil*. London, 1944b.
Knoche, U., 'Zur Frage der epischen Beiwörter in Vergils Aeneis'. *Festschrift Bruno Snell*. Munich, 1956. Pp. 89-100.
Knox, B. M. W., 'The Serpent and the Flame'. *AJP* 71 (1950) 379-400.
——, 'Silent Reading in Antiquity'. *GRBS* 9 (1968) 421-35.
Koch, H., 'Zur Gliederung von Aeneis I und IV'. *Gymnasium* 73 (1966) 506-13.
——, 'Einige Anspielungen auf hintergründige Sachverhalte in den ersten vier Büchern der Aeneis'. *Symbolae Osloenses* 42 (1967) 113-26.
Kollmann, E. D., 'A Study of Proper Names in Virgil's *Eclogues*'. *CW* 69 (1975) 97-112.
Kraggerud, E., *Aeneisstudien*. Symbol. Osl. Suppl. 22. Oslo, 1968.
Kroll, W., *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*. Stuttgart, 1924.
Kühn, W., 'Rüstungsszenen bei Homer und Vergil'. *Gymnasium* 64 (1957) 28-59.
——, *Götterszenen bei Vergil*. Heidelberg, 1971.

Kvíčala, J., *Neue Beiträge zur Erklärung der Aeneis.* Prague, 1881.
La Penna, A., 'Amata e Didone'. *Maia* 19 (1967) 309-18.
Lausberg, H., *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik.* Munich, 1960.
Lawall, G., 'Simaetha's Incantation: Structure and Imagery'. *TAPA* 92 (1961) 283-94.
Legrand, P.-E., *Étude sur Théocrite.* Paris, 1898.
Lenz, C., *Die wiederholten Verse bei Lukrez.* Dresden, 1937.
Lenz, F. W., 'Über die Problematik der Echtheitskritik'. *Das Altertum* 8 (1962) 218-28.
——, 'The Incomplete Verses in Vergil's Eneid: A Critical Report'. In *Vergiliana*, edited by H. Bardon and R. Verdière. Leiden, 1971. Pp. 158-74.
Leo, F., 'Vergil und die *Ciris*'. *Hermes* 37 (1902) 14-55.
——, 'Nochmals die *Ciris* und Vergil'. *Hermes* 42 (1907) 35-77.
——, *Plautinische Forschungen.* 2nd ed. Berlin, 1912.
Leumann, M., 'Die lateinische Dichtersprache'. *MH* 4 (1947) 116-39.
Liebermann, W.-L., 'Aeneas-Schicksal und Selbstfinding'. In *Studien zum antiken Epos*, edited by H. Görgemans and E. A. Schmidt. Meisenheim, 1976. Pp. 173-207.
Lloyd, R. B., 'Penatibus et Magnis Dis'. *AJP* 77 (1956) 38-46.
——, 'Aeneid III: A New Approach'. *AJP* 78 (1957) 133-51.
Löfstedt, E., 'Reminiscence and Imitation: Some Problems in Latin Literature'. *Eranos* 47 (1949) 148-64.
Lord, A. B., 'Composition by Theme in Homer and Southslavic Epos'. *TAPA* 82 (1951) 71-80.
——, *The Singer of Tales.* Cambridge, Mass., 1960.
Lyne, R. O. A. M., 'The Dating of the *Ciris*'. *CQ* 21 (1971) 233-53.
——, *Ciris: A Poem Attributed to Vergil.* Cambridge Class. Texts and Comm. 20. Cambridge, 1978.
Maas, P., 'Hymenaios'. *RE* 9 (1914) 130-34.
——, *Greek Metre.* Translated by H. Lloyd-Jones. Oxford, 1962.
Maass, E., *Arati Phaenomena.* 3rd ed. Berlin, 1964.
MacInnes, J., 'The Conception of *Fata* in the *Aeneid*'. *CR* 24 (1910) 169-74.
Mackail, J. W., *The Aeneid.* Oxford, 1930.
MacKay, L. A., 'Saturnia Juno'. *G&R* n.s. 3 (1956) 59-60.
——, 'Achilles as a Model for Aeneas'. *TAPA* 88 (1957) 11-16.
McGushin, P., 'Virgil and the Spirit of Endurance'. *AJP* 85 (1964) 225-53.
Maguinness, W. S., 'The Language of Lucretius'. In *Lucretius*, edited by D. R. Dudley. London, 1965. Pp. 73-75.
Marouzeau, J., 'Répétitions et hantises verbales chez Virgile'. *Revue des Études Latines* 9 (1931) 237-57.
——, *Traité de stylistique latine.* 2nd ed. Paris, 1946.
Matthaei, L. E., 'The Fates, the Gods, and the Freedom of Man's Will in the *Aeneid*'. *CQ* 9 (1917) 11-26.
Maurach, G., 'Der Pfeilschuss des Ascanius: Zum 9. Buch der Aeneis'. *Gymnasium* 75 (1968) 355-70.
Maury, P., 'Le secret de Virgile et l'architecture des Bucoliques'. *Lettres d'Humanité* 3 (1944) 71-147.
Merguet, H., *Lexikon zu Vergilius mit Angabe sämtlicher Stellen.* Leipzig, 1912 (= Hildesheim, 1960).
Merkelbach, R., 'ΒΟΥΚΟΛΙΑΣΤΑΙ (Der Wettgesang der Hirten)'. *RhM* 99 (1956) 97-133.
Merrill, W. A., 'Parallels and Coincidences in Lucretius and Virgil'. *UCPCP* 3 (1918) 135-247.
——, 'Parallels and Coincidences in Lucretius and Ennius'. *UCPCP* 3 (1918) 249-264.
Meyer, R. M., 'Kriterien zur Aneignung'. *NJbb* 17 (1906) 349-89.
Michenaud, G., 'Les sons du vers virgilien'. *Les Études Classiques* 21 (1953) 343-78.
Minyard, J. D., *Mode and Value in the De Rerum Natura.* Hermes Einzelschriften 39. Wiesbaden, 1978.

Morel, W., *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum.* Leipzig, 1927 (= Stuttgart, 1963).
Moseley, N., *Characters and Epithets.* New Haven, 1926.
Muecke, F., 'Virgil and the Genre Pastoral'. *AMULA* 44 (1975) 169-80.
Muth, R., '"Hymenaios" und "Epithalamion"'. *WS* 67 (1954) 5-45.
Mylius, K., 'Die wiederholten Verse bei Vergil'. Unpubl. diss. Freiburg, 1946.
Mynors, R. A. B., *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina.* Oxford, 1958.
——, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera.* Oxford, 1969.
Nagler, M. N., *Spontaneity and Tradition.* Berkeley, 1974.
Nethercut, W. B., 'Invasion in the *Aeneid*'. *G&R* 15 (1968) 82-95.
——, 'The Imagery of the *Aeneid*'. *CJ* 67 (1971-72) 123-43.
Newton, F. L., 'Studies in Verbal Repetition in Virgil'. Unpubl. diss. Univ. of North Carolina, 1953.
——, 'Recurrent Imagery in *Aeneid* IV'. *TAPA* 88 (1957) 31-43.
Norden, E., *Ennius und Vergilius.* Leipzig, 1915 (= Stuttgart, 1966).
——, *Die antike Kunstprosa.* Berlin, 1918.
——, *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI.* 4th ed. Leipzig, 1927 (= Stuttgart, 1957).
——, 'Orpheus und Eurydice'. *Sitz. Berl. Akad.* 22 (1934) 626-83 = *Kleine Schriften* (1966) 468-532.
Notopoulos, J. A., 'Parataxis in Homer: A New Approach to Homeric Literary Criticism'. *TAPA* 80 (1949) 1-23.
——, 'The Generic and Oral Composition in Homer'. *TAPA* 81 (1950) 28-36.
——, 'Continuity and Interconnexion in Homeric Oral Composition'. *TAPA* 82 (1951) 81-101.
Offermann, H., 'Eine Kleinigkeit zu Vergils Eklogen'. *Grazer Beiträge* 3 (1975) 275-90.
Oppermann, H., *Vergil.* Frankfurt, 1938.
Otis, B., *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry.* Oxford, 1964.
——, 'The Originality of the *Aeneid*'. In *Virgil*, edited by D. R. Dudley. New York, 1969. Pp. 27-66.
Ott, U., *Die Kunst des Gegensatzes in Theokrits Hirtengedichten.* Spudasmata 22. Hildesheim, 1969.
Pagliaro, A. D., 'Amoebaean Song in Ancient Greece'. *AUMLA* 44 (1975) 189-93.
Parry, A. M., 'The Two Voices in Virgil's *Aeneid*'. *Arion* 2/4 (1963) 66-80.
Parry, Milman, *The Making of Homeric Verse.* Edited by A. M. Parry. Oxford, 1971.
Patzer, H., 'Zum Sprachstil des neoterischen Hexameters'. *MH* 12 (1955) 77-95.
Pease, A. S., *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus.* Cambridge, Mass., 1935.
Perret, J., *Virgile, l'homme et l'oeuvre.* Paris, 1952.
——, 'Optimisme et tragédie dans l'Énéide'. *Revue des Études Latines* 45 (1967) 342-62.
Pfeiffer, R., *History of Classical Scholarship.* Oxford, 1968.
Poe, J. P., 'Success and Failure in the Mission of Aeneas'. *TAPA* 96 (1965) 321-36.
Pöschl, V., 'Das Zeichen der Venus und die Gestalt des Aeneas'. In *ΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑ: Festschrift Otto Regenbogen.* Heidelberg, 1952. Pp. 135-43.
——, *Die Hirtendichtung Vergils.* Heidelberg, 1964.
——, *Die Dichtkunst Virgils.* 3rd ed. Berlin, 1977.
Pötscher, W., *Vergil und die göttlichen Mächte.* Spudasmata 35. Hildesheim, 1977.
Pötscher, W., 'Das römische Fatum'. In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Vol. II.16.1 Berlin, 1978. Pp. 409-414.
Pope, M. W. M., 'The Parry-Lord Theory of Homeric Composition'. *Acta Classica* 6 (1963) 1-21.
Posch, S., *Beobachtungen zur Theokritnachahmung bei Vergil.* Commentationes Aenipontanae 19. Innsbruck, 1969.
Poteat, H. M., *Repetition in Latin Poetry.* New York, 1912.
Powell, J. U., *Collectanea Alexandrina.* Oxford, 1925.
Prendergast, G. L., *A Complete Concordance to the Iliad of Homer.* Revised by B. Marzullo. Hildesheim, 1962.

Putnam, M. C. J., *The Poetry of the Aeneid.* Cambridge, Mass., 1965.
——, '*Aeneid* VII and the *Aeneid*'. *AJP* 91 (1970) 408-30.
Quinn, K., *Latin Explorations: Critical Studies in Roman Literature.* London, 1963.
Raabe, H., *Plurima mortis imago: Vergleichende Interpretationen zur Bildersprache Vergils.* Zetemata 59. Munich, 1974.
Radford, R. S., 'The Juvenile Works of Ovid and the Spondaic Period of his Metrical Art'. *TAPA* 51 (1920) 145-71.
Rand, E. K., 'Young Virgil's Poetry'. *HSCP* 30 (1919) 103-85.
Raubitschek, A., 'Zu einigen Wiederholungen bei Lukrez'. *AJP* 59 (1938) 218-23.
Raven, D. S., *Latin Metre.* London, 1965.
Reckford, K. J., 'Latent Tragedy in *Aeneid* VII.1-285'. *AJP* 82 (1961) 252-69.
Regel, G., *De Vergilio poetarum imitatore testimonia.* Göttingen, 1907.
Ribbeck, O., *P. Vergili Maronis Opera.* 4 vols. Leipzig, 1894-95 (= Hildesheim, 1966).
Richter, W., *Vergil: Georgica.* Munich, 1957.
Roberts, L., *A Concordance of Lucretius.* Berkeley, 1968.
Roiron, F. X. M. J., *Étude sur l'imagination auditive de Virgile.* Paris, 1908.
Ross, D. O., *Style and Tradition in Catullus.* Cambridge, Mass., 1969.
——, *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy, and Rome.* Cambridge, 1975.
——, 'The *Culex* and *Moretum* as post-Augustan Literary Parodies'. *HSCP* 79 (1975) 235-63.
Rossi, L. E., 'I generi letterari e le loro leggi scritte e non scritte nelle letterature classiche'. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London* 18 (1971) 69-94.
Rostagni, A., *Virgilio minore.* Turin, 1933.
Ruch, M., 'Le destin dans l'Énéide. Essence et réalité'. In *Vergiliana*, edited by H. Bardon and R. Verdière. Leiden, 1971. Pp. 213-21.
Rudd, N., *Lines of Enquiry: Studies in Latin Poetry.* Cambridge, 1976.
Rütten, F., *De Virgilii studiis Apollonianis.* Münster, 1912.
Sabbadini, R. and Castiglioni, L., *P. Vergili Maronis Bucolica, Georgica.* Turin, 1944.
——, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Libri XII.* Turin, 1944.
Schadewaldt, W., 'Sinn und Werden der Vergilischen Dichtung'. In *Hellas und Hesperien.* Zurich, 1960. Pp. 498-519.
Schlunk, R. R., *The Homeric Scholia and the* Aeneid*: A Study of the Influence of Ancient Homeric Literary Criticism on Vergil.* Ann Arbor, 1974.
Schmidt, C. E., *Parallel-Homer.* Göttingen, 1885.
Schmidt, E. A., *Poetische Reflexion: Vergils Bukolik.* Munich, 1972.
Scott, K., 'The Identification of Augustus with Romulus Quirinus'. *TAPA* 56 (1925) 82-105.
Segal, C. P., '*Aeternum per Saecula Nomen*: The Golden Bough and the Tragedy of History: Part I'. *Arion* 4 (1965) 617-57.
——, '*Aeternum per Saecula Nomen*: The Golden Bough and the Tragedy of History: Part II'. *Arion* 5 (1966) 34-72.
——, 'Orpheus and the Fourth *Georgic*'. *AJP* 87 (1966) 307-25.
——, 'Vanishing Shades: Virgil and Homeric Repetitions'. *Eranos* 72 (1974) 34-52.
——, 'Landscape into Myth: Theocritus' Bucolic Poetry'. *Ramus* 4 (1975) 115-39.
Sellar, W. Y., *The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age: Virgil.* 3rd ed. Oxford, 1897.
Sforza, F., 'The Problem of Virgil'. *CR* 49 (1935) 97-108.
Shipley, F. W., 'Virgil's Verse Technique: Some Deductions from the Half-lines'. *Washington University Studies*, Hum. Ser. 12 (1924) 115-51.
Sittl, K., *Wiederholungen in der Odyssee.* Munich, 1882.
Skutsch, F., *Aus Vergils Frühzeit.* Leipzig, 1901.
——, *Gallus und Vergil.* Leipzig, 1906.
Skutsch, O., *Studia Enniana.* London, 1968.
——, 'Symmetry and Sense in the *Eclogues*'. *HSCP* 73 (1969) 153-69.
Smith, M. F., 'Some Lucretian Thought Processes'. *Hermathena* 102 (1966) 73-83.

Sparrow, J., *Half-lines and Repetitions in Virgil.* Oxford, 1931.
Steiner, H. R., *Der Traum in der Aeneis.* Noctes Romanae 5. Berne, 1952.
Steinmetz, P., 'Gattungen und Epochen der griechischen Literatur'. *Hermes* 92 (1964) 454-66.
Thilo, G. and Hagen, H., *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii.* 3 vols. Leipzig, 1881-87.
Todd, F., 'Virgil's Invocation of Erato'. *CR* 45 (1931) 216-18.
Tracy, H. L., '*Fata Deum* and the Action of the *Aeneid*'. *G&R* 11 (1964) 188-95.
Traglia, A., *Ciceronis Poetica Fragmenta.* 2 vols. Rome, 1950-52.
Vahlen, I., *Ennianae Poesis Reliquiae.* 2nd ed. Leipzig, 1928 (= Amsterdam, 1967).
Van Otterlo, W. A. A., 'Untersuchungen über Begriff, Anwendung und Entstehung der griechischen Ringkomposition'. *Mededeel. Nederl. Akad. van Wetens.* 7/3 (1944) 131-76.
——, *De ringcompositie als opbouwprincipe in de epische gedichten van Homerus.* Verhandel. der Nederl. Akad. van Wetensch., Afd. Letterkunde 51/ 1 (Amsterdam, 1948)
Van Sickle, J., 'The Unity of the *Eclogues*: Arcadian Forest, Theocritean Trees'. *TAPA* 98 (1967) 491-508.
——, 'Epic and Bucolic'. *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 19 (1975) 3-30.
——, 'Theocritus and the Development of the Conception of the Bucolic Genre'. *Ramus* 5 (1976) 18-44.
——, *The Design of Virgil's* Bucolics. Rome, 1978.
Vivante, P., 'Rose-fingered Dawn and the Idea of Time'. *Ramus* 8 (1979) 125-36.
Vretska, K., 'Zur Methodik der Echtheitskritik'. *WS* 70 (1957) 306-21.
Walter, O., *Die Entstehung der Halbverse in der Aeneis.* Giessen, 1933.
Warwick, H. H., *A Vergil Concordance.* Minneapolis, 1975.
Wendel, C., *Scholia in Theocritum vetera.* Leipzig, 1914.
Westendorp Boerma, R. E. H., 'On Dating the *Copa*'. *Mnemosyne* 11 (1958) 331-38.
——, 'Où en est aujourd'hui l'énigme de l'Appendix Vergiliana?' In *Vergiliana*, edited by H. Bardon and R. Verdière. Leiden, 1971. Pp. 386-421.
Wetmore, M. N., *Index Verborum Catullianus.* New Haven, 1912 (= Hildesheim, 1961).
Whallon, W., 'The Homeric Epithets'. *YCS* 17 (1961) 97-142.
——, 'The Shield of Ajax'. *YCS* 19 (1966) 5-36.
——, *Formula, Character, and Context.* Cambridge, Mass., 1969.
Wheeler, A. L., 'Tradition in the Epithalamium'. *AJP* 51 (1930) 205-23.
Whitman, C. H., *Homer and the Heroic Tradition.* Cambridge, Mass., 1958.
Wiesen, D. S., 'The Pessimism in the Eighth *Aeneid*'. *Latomus* 32 (1973) 737-65.
Wigodsky, M., *Vergil and Early Latin Poetry.* Hermes Einzelschriften 24. Wiesbaden, 1972.
Wilkinson, L. P., 'The Augustan Rules for Dactylic Verse'. *CQ* 34 (1940) 30-43.
——, 'The Language of Virgil and Horace'. *CQ* n.s. 9 (1959) 181-92.
——, *Golden Latin Artistry.* Cambridge, 1963.
——, *The Georgics of Virgil.* Cambridge, 1969.
Williams, G., *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry.* Oxford, 1968.
——, *Figures of Thought in Roman Poetry.* New Haven, 1980.
Williams, R. D., *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quintus.* Oxford, 1960.
——, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Tertius.* Oxford, 1962.
Willis, J., *Ambrosii Theodosii Macrobii Saturnalia.* Leipzig, 1970.
Winbolt, S. E., *Latin Hexameter Verse.* London, 1903.
Wlosok, A., *Die Göttin Venus in Vergils Aeneis.* Heidelberg, 1967.
Wolff, E., 'Der Brand der Schiffe und Aeneas' Wiedergeburt'. *MH* 20 (1963) 151-71.
Wormell, D. E. W., 'The Originality of the *Eclogues*'. In *Virgil*, edited by D. R. Dudley. New York, 1969. Pp. 1-26.
Worstbrock, F. J., *Elemente einer Poetik der Aeneis.* Orbis Antiquus 21. Münster, 1963.

INDEX LOCORUM*

ACCIUS
fr. 653 (Ribbeck)—82

AESCHYLUS
Ag. 681-98—169 n77
Eum. 804-891—158 n55

ANACREON
fr. 4 (D)—98

ANTHOLOGIA LATINA
10.31—76 n8
18.45—76 n8

APOLLONIUS RHODIUS
1.2-3(R)—62
1.293-94(R)—64
1.294(R)—62
1.331(R)—64
1.343-44(R)—64
1.450(R)—67
1.526-27(R)—62
1.559-68—93 n45
1.605-608—93 n45
1.611-13(R)—61
1.710-11(R)—60, 64
1.713-16(R)—60
1.717(R)—62
1.791-92(R)—64
1.804-807(R)—61
1.835(R)—64
1.899(R)—64
1.910-14—93 n45
1.953-57—93 n45
1.1003(R)—62
1.1012-20—93 n45
1.1080(R)—67
1.1152-69—93 n45
1.1252-79—93 n45
1.1280-82—69 n87
1.1330-31(R)—64
1.1336(R)—62, 64
2.164(R)—67
2.449(R)—67
2.621(R)—62
2.669-71—69 n87
2.885(R)—62
2.1001(R)—67
2.1068(R)—62
2.119-20(R)—67
2.1134(R)—62
2.1154(R)—62
2.1231(R)—67
2.1285(R)—67
3.1—*160*
3.5—160
3.6-110—160 n60
3.111-66—160 n60, 165
3.145(R)—62
3.211—160 n60
3.215-74—161 n60
3.275-98—161 n60, 165
3.284—165, 166 n70
3.291-95—175 n84
3.296—165
3.299-438—161 n60
3.354(R)—62
3.409-410(R)—60
3.495-96(R)—60
3.744-824—174
3.744-50—69
3.744-45—175 n83
3.751-52—175 n83
3.755-59—*175*
3.756-59—175 n84
3.758-59—97 n52
3.798-99—175 n83
3.823-24(R)—67
3.1191-93—69 n87
3.1224(R)—67
3.1340-42—69 n87
4.109-113—69
4.350-420—134
4.350-54—134 n106
4.358-59—134 n106
4.364—134 n106
4.382-87—134 n106
4.389—134 n106
4.391-93—134 n106
4.394(R)—62
4.395—134 n106

* Italicized numbers indicate pages on which a particular passage is discussed; an 'R' in parentheses indicates repetition.

4.445—*133*
4.458(R)—67
4.582-83(R)—62
4.981(R)—67
4.1001-1003(R)—62
4.1106-1108(R)—61
4.1118-20(R)—61
4.1170-75—69 n87
4.1317(R)—62
4.1323-28(R)—61
4.1353-58(R)—61
4.1629(R)—67

ARATUS
Phaen. 783-87—74 n2

ARISTOPHANES
Ach. 1097-1221—42 n34
Lys. 373-74—42 n34
Nub. 908-909—42 n34
Pax 1332-54—42 n34, 46 n46

ATHENAEUS
13.555a-b—160

CALVUS
fr. 9 (Morel)—83

CALLIMACHUS
Hymn 3.110—53 n57
Hymn 3.259—53 n57
Hymn 4.109—53 n57
Hymn 4.226—53 n57
Hymn 4.325—53 n57

CARMINA POPULARIA
17-18 (D)—42 n34
36 (D)—42 n34

CATULLUS
5.6—91 n42
11.22-24—101
51.11-12—91 n42
61—46 n46
62—46 n46
64.62—174 n82
64.85—82 n20
64.141—77 n9
64.166—150 n29
64.323-86—46 n46
64.327—51

CICERO
Aratea fr. 34 (Traglia)—38
De Or. 2.177—6 n6
De Or. 3.97-103—6 n6
De Or. 3.192-93—6 n6
De Or. 3.206—6 n6
Fam. 9.15.3—137 n2
Fam. 12.15—137 n2

DIODORUS
4.7.3-4—160
7.3.2—157 n52

DIOGENES LAERTIUS
10.7—59 n76

DIONYSIUS
1.64.4-5—157 n52

DONATUS, Aelius
Vita Verg. 23-24—6
Vita Verg. 41—7 n9

DONATUS, Tiberius
Int. Verg. proem.—5

ENNIUS
Annales (Vahlen)
18—83
23—*113*
29(R)—56, 88 n35
30-31—82
36-38—55
37—152 n32
41-44—55
47—142 n14
59—142 n14
64—81
80—83
87-88—55
94-96—55
102(R)—56
109—55
113—82, 87 n33
114(R)—56
117—82
131(R)—56
159(R)—56, 88 n35
161(R)—56
167—56
175(R)—56, 86 n30
183-85—55
187-88—55
192—81, 86 n31
194-96—155 n44
198—96
207—55
211—88 n35
224(R)—56, 98 n54

232—98 n54
236-43—55
240-41—55
252—55
265—55
266-67—*168*
268-69—55
270—55-56
273—56
277(R)—56, 98 n54
284—91 n43
292-93—111 n75
307—55
309—55
327—55
339(R)—56, 88 n35
340—55
359—55
377-78—55
384-85—93 n47, n48
386(R)—56
395—55
401-407—55
405-408—92
412(R)—56
431—56
439(R)—56, 98 n54
444-45—55
458—81, 86 n31
478(R)—56
480—55
519-20—55
521—55
556—55
580(R)—56, 86 n30
581—56, 86 n30
586—96
621—55
Scenica (Vahlen)
177—81
184—98 n54
190—98 n54

EPITAPHIOS BIONOS
8—51

EURIPIDES
Hipp. 39—98
Med. 1251—181 n98
Med. 1370-74—42 n34

GELLIUS
13.21.4—7 n10

HESIOD
Op. 1-2—51
Op. 5-7—44 n40
Op. 25-26—44 n40
Op. 182-84—44 n40
Op. 246-47—44 n40
Op. 253-56—44 n40
Op. 578-80—44 n40
Op. 615—95
Op. 715-16—44 n40
Op. 750-59—44 n40
Th. 25—51
Th. 36—53 n57
Th. 114—51
Th. 830-35—44 n40
Th. 1021—53 n57

HOMER
Iliad
1.22(R)—96
1.37-42—143 n16
1.43(R)—90
1.189(R)—97
1.297(R)—96
1.376(R)—96
1.436—93 n48
1.469-70—127 n97
1.528-30—107
1.551(R)—81
1.544(R)—81, 86 n30
2.434(R)—86
2.484(R)—51, 107
2.494-760—107
2.503-505—44 n40
2.521-23—44 n40
2.632-35—44 n40
3.18-19—88
3.171(R)—83
3.227—89
3.378—83
4.442-43—98
5.4-6—139 n8
5.82-83(R)—91
5.310—91
5.436—149 n24
5.659—91
6.450-55—44 n40
7.157—96
7.215(R)—96
7.403(R)—96
7.411(R)—81
8.167—97
8.306-307—101
9.50(R)—96

9.447-48(R)—*116*
9.478(R)—*116*
9.485(R)—117
9.494(R)—117
10.4—97 n52
10.535—98
11.43—88
11.62-63—139 n8
11.218(R)—107
11.241—91
11.356—91
11.604—169 n77
11.670—96
12.22-23—128
13.455—97
14.20-21—97 n52
14.268—77 n10
14.425—87
14.508(R)—107
15.37-38(R)—107
16.85(R)—83
16.109-111—92
16.112(R)—107
16.168-97—107
16.435—97 n52
16.502-503(R)—91
16.680—183 n100
16.691—98
16.702-709—149 n24
16.779—69 n87
16.856-57(R)—*102*
17.279-80(R)—101 n59
17.569-70—98
17.754—87
18.205-213—139 n8
18.219-20—125
18.354-55—183 n100
18.486-87—95
19.128(R)—88 n35
20.5—86 n31
20.44(R)—96
20.175(R)—82
20.375-78—149 n24
21.114-18—*155*
21.122-35—154 n31
21.218-20—128
21.234-39—128
21.362-64—175 n84
22.26-31—139 n8
22.116—169 n77
22.362-63(R)—*102*
23.629(R)—96
24.197—96
24.309—143 n16
24.580—183 n100
24.785—68
24.796—183 n100

Odyssey
2.422-23(R)—94 n50, 123
3.67(R)—127 n96
4.52-58—12 n19
4.351-72—12 n19
4.513—81
5.41-42(R)—110
5.114-15(R)—110
5.185-86—107
5.297—78
7.244-46(R)—*117*
7.253-56(R)—*117*
8.73-82—117 n82
8.115-17—101 n59
8.219-20—117 n82
8.465(R)—81
8.487-520—117 n82
9.58—69 n87
9.104(R)—93 n49, 130
9.116-41—163 n64
9.172—83
9.528-35—*157*
9.534-35(R)—112 n76, 157 n54
9.552(R)—81
10.87-94—163 n64
10.144-73—167 n72
11.6-7(R)—93 n46, 130 n102
11.110-14(R)—112 n76
11.114-15(R)—112 n76, 157 n54
11.206-208—152 n33
11.541-64—159
11.550-51(R)—101 n59
12.73-80—163 n64
12.137-41(R)—112 n76
12.147(R)—93 n49
12.148-49(R)—93 n46, 130 n102
12.171-72—93 n47
12.317-18—163 n64
12.403-406—94 n51
12.445(R)—81
12.447-50(R)—*117*
13.4-5—117
13.25(R)—81
13.96-104—12 n19, 162 n64
14.301-304—94 n51
15.287-88(R)—94 n50, 123
15.498—93 n48
16.73—97 n52

19.390-94(R)—*116*
19.464-68(R)—116
19.524—97
20.351-52—102 n60
22.125—88

HOMERIC HYMNS
2.1—53 n57
2.54—53 n57
3.211-15—44 n40
4.263-66—44 n40
4.363-64—44 n40
4.567-70—44 n40
5.92-99—44 n40
6.19—53 n57
7.58—53 n57
10.1—53 n57
12.1—53 n57
13.1-3—53 n57
17.1—53 n57
18.1, 12—53 n57
20.1—53 n57
22.1, 6—53 n57
28.1—53 n57
30.1—53 n57

HORACE
Carm. 3.3.21-22—173 n81
Sat. 2.1.57-58—102 n60

LIVY
1.2.6—157 n52

LIVIUS ANDRONICUS
fr. 32 (Morel)—82 n22

LUCIAN
Ind. 2—74 n1

LUCRETIUS
1.28—143 n16
1.36—34 n21
1.117-19—57
1.133—111 n75
1.196-98—58
1.823-26—58
1.907-14—58
2.29-30—59 n77
2.129-31—97 n52
2.206-208—139 n9
2.327-30—98 n54
2.503—34 n21
2.686-99—58
2.755—34 n21
2.757—34 n21
2.811—34 n21
2.818(R)—34 n21
2.1013-21—58
3.1-30—60 n77
3.52-53—91 n41
3.992—34 n21
4.174—34 n21
4.316—34 n21
4.869—34 n21
4.1101—34 n21
4.1141—34 n21
4.1146—34 n21
4.1215—98
4.1265—98 n54
5.399—81
5.400—82 n20
5.974—111 n75
5.1191—139 n9
5.1392-96—59 n77
6.34—174 n82
6.74—174 n82
6.173—34 n21
6.357—88 n35
6.700—34 n21
6.724—34 n21

MACROBIUS
Sat. 1.24.8—5 n4
Sat. 2.1.1—3
Sat. 4.6.23—3
Sat. 5.1.1—5 n4
Sat. 5.7.8—152 n33
Sat. 5.12.5-6—157
Sat. 5.14.6—3
Sat. 5.15.14-15—3
Sat. 5.15.16—3
Sat. 6.3.1—92

NAEVIUS
fr. 15 (Morel)—87 n32

OVID
A.A. 2.16—160
Fast. 4.195-96—160
Fast. 6.636—138 n7
Met. 10.279—138 n7
Pont. 4.9.54—138 n7

QUINTILIAN
5.14.30—6 n6
8.3.52—6 n6
9.3.28-88—5 n5
9.4.12—37

PERSIUS
3.103—125 n94

PLATO
Phdr. 259c—160

PLUTARCH
Mor. 746e-f—160

PSEUDO-PROBUS
on E 1.59-60—2
on E 4.58—2
on A 1.607-608—2

RHETORICA AD HERENNIUM
1.12.18—6 n6, 37
4.12.18-28—5 n5
4.12.38—5 n5
4.14.21—6 n6
4.20.28—36
4.23.32—6 n6
4.31.42—6 n6

SAPPHO
fr. 27 (D)—44 n40
fr. 123 (D)—46 n46
fr. 131 (D)—42 n34

SCHOLIA BERNENSIA
on E 1.4—5
on E 5.86—5
on E 8.21—5
on G 2.173—5

SERVIUS
on E 8.5—4
on E 8.50—4
on A 1.55—4 n3
on A 1.150—4 n2
on A 1.216—4 n3
on A 1.245—4 n3
on A 1.654—163 n65
on A 1.717—166
on A 1.723—4 n3, 127
on A 2.683—138 n7
on A 2.693—141
on A 2.775(R)—4
on A 3.12—136 n1
on A 3.153(R)—4
on A 3.163-66—4 n3
on A 3.589(R)—4 n3
on A 3.689—120
on A 4.7(R)—4 n3
on A 4.204—4 n2
on A 4.316—77 n9
on A 4.348—4 n2
on A 4.412—4 n3
on A 4.418(R)—2
on A 4.504—37
on A 4.620—157 n52
on A 4.625—168 n75
on A 5.235—4 n3
on A 5.432(R)—2
on A 5.457—6 n8
on A 6.39—4 n3
on A 6.176—4 n3
on A 6.186—6 n8
on A 6.635—4 n3
on A 6.697—4 n3
on A 7.37—160
on A 8.43—4 n3
on A 8.80—4 n3
on A 9.44—37
on A 9.110—4 n3
on A 9.236—4 n3
on A 9.814(R)—2
on A 10.85—4 n3
on A 10.272—139 n9, n10
on A 11.183—70 n88
on A 11.192—125
on A 11.831—4 n3
on A 11.885—4 n3
on A 12.952—4 n3

SOPHOCLES
O.R. 547-52—42 n34

SUETONIUS
Aug. 7—138 n5
Iul. 88—139 n10
Ill. Gramm. 24—7 n10

THEOCRITUS
Idylls
1—*48*
1.1-3—46
1.7-8—45 n42
1.12—51
1.15—51
1.29-30—53
1.64—51
1.66-75—46
1.66-69—45 n42
1.66—51
1.67—52
1.71-75—47 n48
1.71-72—45
1.77-95—47 n48
1.77-81—45 n42

1.87-88(R)—47
1.90-91(R)—47
1.94—51
1.95-96—53
1.120-21(R)—47
1.127—51
1.132-34—46
1.144-45—53
2—*48*
2.18-21—48 n49
2.21-62—54 n59
2.28-31—47
2.58-62—48 n49
2.69—53 n57
2.118—51
2.165—52
3.3-4—53
4.1-58—54 n59
4.5-6—43 n36
4.13-14—43 n36
4.31—52
4.38-42—43 n36
4.41-44—43 n36
5.4(R)—42
5.19(R)—42
5.31-35—43 n36
5.50-59—42-3
5.61-63—43 n36
5.69-71(R)—42
5.72-74—43 n36
5.100-102—43 n36
5.104—52
5.112-134—43 n36
6.11-14—49
7.52-61—54 n59
7.57-59—53
7.149-52—49
8.3-4—45
8.11-12(R)—43
8.18-19(R)—43
8.21-22(R)—43
8.28-29(R)—50
8.33-48—43
8.57-59—46
8.63-70—49 n50
8.72-80—49 n50
8.76-78—46
8.79-80—45 n42
9.1-2—53
9.7-13—49 n50
9.7-8—46
9.15-21—49 n50, 50
9.28—53 n57
9.31-35—46
10.24-37—49 n50
10.26-36—54 n59
10.27-28—45 n42
10.30-31—45
10.42-55—49 n50
11.20—45 n42
11.22-23(R)—49
11.45-47—45 n42, 46

THEOGNIS
1-15—53 n57

TIBULLUS
2.5.56—113

VARRO
Sat. Men. 494—142 n14

VERGIL
Eclogues
1.3-4—28 n9
1.8-16—28 n9
1.22-23—45 n41
1.27-29—54
1.32-41—28 n9
1.38—52
1.46-51—54 n59
1.53-56—28 n9
1.57-58—28 n9
1.59-61—45 n42
1.74—51
2.8-9—50
2.18—45 n42
2.63-64—45
3.6-19—28 n9, 29
3.12-22—44 n38
3.43(R)—43
3.47(R)—43
3.49-54—43
3.56-57—45
3.60-61—45 n41
3.76-77—28 n9, 44
3.80-83—45 n41
3.82-84—45 n41
3.84-87—44 n38
3.88-92—29
3.104-107(R)—44 n38
4.11—51
4.24-25—53
4.32-36—45 n41
4.50-52—50
4.58-60(R)—3, 50
5—49 n50

5.8-18—148 n22
5.16-18—45
5.32-34—45 n42
5.45-47—45 n42
5.52-61—148 n22
5.62-64—45 n41
5.76-78(R)—3, 45
6.10—34 n21
6.20-21—53
6.25—51
6.29-30—50
6.46—34 n21
6.47-52—54 n59
6.47—83
6.55-66—54
6.61-64—29
7.4-5—45
7.31-43—29
7.37-44—44
7.37-38—45 n41
7.37—45 n42
7.41-43—45 n41
7.44—51
7.59-68(R)—44
8—*48-49*
8.1-5(R)—54
8.21—49
8.29-30—47
8.29a—48 n50
8.47-50—47, 134 n106
8.52-56—45 n41
8.56-57—53
8.61—49, 51
8.68—49, 51
8.76—48 n50
8.77-78—47, 54
8.85-89—47
8.109—49, 51
9.10-18—148 n22
9.17—52
9.27-28—53
9.40-42—45 n42, 46
9.64-65—28 n9, 51
10.9-12—45 n42
10.10—34 n21
10.11—52
10.13-15—45
10.19-21—45 n42
10.29-30—45
10.37-41—50, 148 n22
10.39-43—54 n59
10.39—45 n42
10.42-43—45 n42, 46
10.72-73—54
10.77—51
Georgics
1.22-23—28 n9
1.28(R)—*19*
1.37-49—31
1.73-83—31
1.77-78—28 n9
1.104-111—28 n9
1.133-54—31
1.139-45—28 n9, 30
1.158-61—30 n12
1.280-325—31
1.280-98—28 n9
1.304(R)—2
1.313-22—28 n9
1.341-42—40
1.365-67—139 n9
1.387-96—32
1.429-33—74 n2
1.488—139 n10
1.498(R)—*147*
1.501-502—173 n81
2.45-52—30
2.189-223—30
2.33-49—30
2.388-95—30 n12
2.472(R)—*108*
2.497-508—32
2.523-40—32
2.528(R)—127 n97
3.9—19
3.17—19
3.21(R)—*19*
3.35-36—20
3.37-41—30
3.53-59—30 n12
3.257-65—28 n9
3.409-416—30 n12
3.447(R)—34 n21
3.486—34 n21
4.89-114—31
4.157-72—31
4.179-83—30 n12
4.218—92
4.278-302—31
4.289-93—30 n12
4.376-79—12 n19
4.420—12 n19
4.458-77—31
4.465-66—3
4.465-66—40
4.497-502—*152 n32, n36*

4.501-502(R)—65
4.525-27—3
Aeneid 1
1.5-7—106 n68
1.6-11—31 n18
1.25-28—37 n24
1.28-30(R)—*106*
1.39-40—164 n68
1.40-45—37 n24
1.46—164 n68
1.53-59—37 n24
1.60(R)—81
1.62-70—37 n24
1.62—77
1.63-66—28 n9
1.65-80—*75*
1.65(R)—86
1.69-70—164 n68
1.72(R)—*77*
1.73(R)—76 n9, *77*, 104
1.81(R)—65 n82
1.82-93—30
1.84-90—*99-100*
1.85—34 n21
1.87(R)—125 n93
1.92(R)—*78*, *118*
1.95(R)—87
1.100-101(R)—9 n14, *128*
1.120-21—40
1.120—83
1.124(R)—9 n14, *76-80*, 104
1.131(R)—65 n82
1.161—12 n19
1.184-93—167
1.187-93—30
1.188—83
1.202-209—37 n24
1.216(R)—3, *127*
1.220(R)—*103*
1.222(R)—83, 103, *126*
1.224-28—37 n24
1.241—118 n83
1.247-61—28 n9
1.254(R)—*118*
1.256(R)—65 n82
1.259-60—118 n83
1.260(R)—81
1.263—158 n56
1.267(R)—83
1.279-80—37 n24
1.290-93—37 n24
1.296-97—37 n24
1.299—83
1.305(R)—82
1.313(R)—88
1.314-24—167
1.378(R)—82
1.389(R)—*122*
1.401(R)—*122*
1.406(R)—65
1.408-409(R)—*150*
1.411-14—160 n60
1.441-93—161 n60
1.443(R)—81
1.446(R)—83
1.458-84—34 n22
1.467(R)—84
1.479-82(R)—*159*, 169
1.490-91(R)—*132*
1.496(R)—*77 n12*, 83, 103
1.497(R)—127 n98
1.498-502—132, 156
1.510(R)—83, 87
1.520-636—161 n60
1.520-21(R)—*128-29*
1.526—129
1.530-33(R)—22 n2, *112*
1.539-41—129
1.545(R)—*129*
1.559-60(R)—96
1.571(R)—*176*
1.573-74—77 n11
1.575—163
1.579—83
1.580(R)—82
1.582(R)—96
1.586(R)—65 n82
1.596(R)—82
1.598(R)—106 n68
1.607-609—3
1.612(R)—83, 103, *126*
1.613(R)—83
1.614(R)—65 n82
1.617-26—163
1.617-18—176
1.617(R)—83
1.619—176
1.627(R)—*176*
1.647-55—*163*
1.648-52—169
1.648-49(R)—95
1.657-90—160 n60, 165-66
1.659-60(R)—*165*
1.663(R)—65
1.664-65—28 n9
1.673—177 n87

1.674-86—31 n18
1.688—*165*
1.691-92—182
1.699-708—176
1.699-700—40, *121*
1.699(R)—82, 84
1.701-706—12 n19
1.708(R)—*121*
1.711(R)—95
1.712-22—161 n60
1.717-18—166
1.718—83
1.719-29—31 n18
1.723(R)—3, *127*
1.723-24(R)—*161*
1.724(R)—127 n97
1.744(R)—94
1.747-54—31 n18
1.749(R)—83

Aeneid 2
2.1-2(R)—*117*
2.9(R)—9 n14, 66, *162 n61*
2.15-24—32
2.36-48—30
2.40(R)—*127*
2.47-55—30
2.58-59—96
2.63(R)—84
2.74(R)—*124*
2.120-21(R)—97
2.147(R)—65
2.192-94—178 n90
2.213(R)—*121-22*
2.229-70—31
2.230(R)—*121-22*
2.233—102 n61
2.268-73—181
2.289(R)—142
2.293—146
2.294-95—152 n34
2.296-97—146
2.304-310—31 n18
2.313(R)—*125*
2.319(R)—84
2.323(R)—65 n82
2.330-63—32
2.339-41(R)—*119*
2.351-62—31 n18
2.353—102
2.360-63—28 n9
2.360(R)—*102*
2.370(R)—*127*
2.380—34 n21
2.386—*119*
2.403(R)—84
2.411(R)—*129*
2.420-31—31 n18
2.424-28(R)—*119*
2.465—34 n21
2.479(R)—*153*
2.483-84—28 n9
2.487(R)—*153*
2.494(R)—*153*
2.511(R)—92
2.513-20—31 n18
2.548—34 n22
2.552-53(R)—*155*
2.557-58—157 n52, *164*
2.560-62—*141*
2.573—171
2.637—100
2.648(R)—86
2.654—100
2.682-84—*138*
2.683—142
2.685-86—142
2.687-93—*141*
2.687(R)—82, *142*
2.689-90(R)—*143-45*
2.692(R)—65 n82, *142*
2.693(R)—145
2.694-700—138
2.694—139 n9
2.697(R)—139 n9, *142*
2.702(R)—*146*
2.703(R)—146
2.717—136, 146
2.747—146
2.764-72—31 n18
2.769-84—34 n22
2.775(R)—64, *105*
2.779(R)—86
2.781-83—152 n34
2.783(R)—84, 169
2.789-91(R)—*151-52*
2.789—179 n94
2.790-91(R)—65, *152*
2.790(R)—65 n82
2.792-94(R)—22 n2, *151-52*

Aeneid 3
3.9(R)—82
3.12(R)—19, *136*
3.16(R)—128
3.27-29—142
3.34-36—142
3.40(R)—66 n82, *128*

3.44(R)—142
3.51-55—118 n84
3.56(R)—*133*
3.65(R)—*118*
3.78(R)—128
3.80-82—90
3.80-81—154 n43
3.80(R)—84
3.85-89—28 n9
3.85—143 n16
3.86-87(R)—*106*
3.89-90(R)—*141-42*
3.90(R)—65 n82
3.93(R)—66 n82, *128*
3.96—140
3.97-98—149, 179
3.97(R)—128
3.130(R)—93, *130*
3.131(R)—93, *130*
3.134-44—33
3.136-41—31 n18
3.147-52—181
3.147(R)—66, 105 n66, *162 n61*, 174
3.153(R)—64, *105*
3.154-55—149 n26
3.163-66(R)—22 n2, *112*
3.167(R)—*112*, *140*
3.169(R)—105 n66
3.175-82—28 n9
3.176-78—146
3.192-95(R)—4 n3, 22 n2, 94
3.208(R)—93
3.222-32—30
3.248-49—173 n81
3.250(R)—96
3.251—149 n26
3.263-75—28 n9, 30 n14
3.263(R)—82
3.272—34 n22
3.277(R)—93
3.290(R)—93, *130*
3.321(R)—84
3.322(R)—87
3.339—83
3.343(R)—9 n14, 82
3.380(R)—81
3.388—113
3.390-93(R)—22 n2, *113*, 123
3.395(R)—23
3.406—34 n21
3.429-30(R)—94, *124*,
3.438-39(R)—123
3.439-40—*20*
3.458—158 n56, 169
3.459-91—30 n14
3.459(R)—9 n14, *114*
3.467(R)—95
3.471(R)—94, *123*
3.474—149 n26
3.485(R)—65 n82
3.495(R)—9 n14
3.516(R)—94
3.521(R)—66, *162 n61*
3.525(R)—82
3.527(R)—23, *137*
3.537-40—181
3.539-58—30 n14
3.539-40—158 n56
3.539(R)—82
3.558(R)—82
3.588-90(R)—66
3.608-609(R)—*124*
3.613-14(R)—*120*
3.629—34 n22
3.655(R)—65 n82
3.658(R)—90
3.676-84—32
3.691(R)—*120*
3.716-18(R)—82, *117*

Aeneid 4
4.4-5—*166*
4.5(R)—*181-82*
4.6(R)—*161*
4.6-8(R)—67
4.25(R)—81
4.57(R)—91
4.60(R)—83, 103
4.63-83—33
4.67(R)—*165*
4.68-69—171
4.69-73—*166*
4.70-71—168 n73
4.72-73—168 n73
4.81(R)—66, *162 n61*
4.90-128—*75*, 160 n60
4.91(R)—81, *164-65*
4.102-103—167
4.112(R)—*168*
4.114(R)—81
4.119(R)—67
4.120-25(R)—*115*
4.125-26(R)—76 n9, *168*
4.126(R)—8 n11, *76*, 104
4.129(R)—67, *182*
4.130(R)—84

4.134—182
4.136(R)—127 n98
4.141(R)—*77 n12*, 103
4.143-49—156
4.154-55—167
4.156-59—167
4.156(R)—83
4.160(R)—9 n14, *76-80*, 104
4.161-66(R)—*115*
4.162(R)—84
4.166—168
4.169-70(R)—80, 158 n56, *166-67*, 169-70
4.173-81—32
4.177(R)—98
4.181(R)—90
4.189-95—28 n9
4.197(R)—65
4.206-208(R)—*143-44*, 148 n23
4.215—169
4.219(R)—64, 90
4.226(R)—110
4.230(R)—87
4.232-36(R)—*110*
4.247-48—28 n9
4.263-64—9 n14, *183*
4.270(R)—*110*
4.271-75(R)—*110*
4.272-76—149
4.274-76—179
4.276(R)—66 n82
4.277-78(R)—*148*
4.279-85—28 n9, 32
4.281—34 n21
4.285-86(R)—22 n2, 97, *174*
4.288(R)—83, 87
4.292—156 n51
4.296-392—134
4.296-304—134 n106
4.296(R)—172 n80
4.300-302—171
4.304(R)—65
4.305-316—156 n51
4.307—134 n106
4.308(R)—172 n80
4.311—134 n106
4.314(R)—172 n80
4.316—77 n9
4.319—172 n80
4.320—134 n106
4.331-32—156 n51, 159 n57
4.345-61(R)—109
4.351(R)—83
4.354-55—149 n27, 181
4.354—83
4.357(R)—*110*
4.360—134 n106
4.365-73—156 n51
4.371(R)—81
4.376-81(R)—109
4.377-80—150 n28
4.382-87—134 n106
4.384—167
4.386—157
4.390-91(R)—65
4.391-92(R)—*177*
4.392(R)—82
4.412(R)—*133*
4.427(R)—83
4.429—*159*
4.431—156 n51
4.435—*159*
4.450(R)—*171*
4.458—34 n21
4.481-82(R)—88
4.483(R)—*122*
4.498(R)—*122*
4.522-33—69 n86
4.522-25(R)—*174*
4.522-23(R)—66
4.529-32—182
4.532(R)—*166*, *173*, 175 n84
4.540-52—32
4.541-42—*173*
4.542—156 n51, 174
4.554-59—181-82
4.554(R)—*137*
4.558-59(R)—*148*
4.563—133
4.564—173
4.579—93
4.583(R)—93
4.584-85(R)—22 n2, 67
4.592-94—167
4.596(R)—83
4.597—156 n51
4.600-606—133, *181*
4.604-606—134 n106
4.608-610—157
4.610-14—30 n14
4.612-20—*157*
4.612-14(R)—*177*
4.615—174
4.616—180
4.617-18—*179*
4.617—158 n56

4.625-27—*167*, 168 n75
4.630—97
4.631(R)—177
4.643(R)—*172*
4.644-50—32
4.644(R)—23
4.663-64—178
4.666-84—177 n88
4.666-68(R)—*172*
4.669-71—*172*
4.689(R)—*165*
4.693-94—131
4.701(R)—*131*

Aeneid 5
5.8-11(R)—4 n3, 22 n2, 94
5.14(R)—65 n82
5.16(R)—65 n82
5.17(R)—81
5.26(R)—82
5.31(R)—83
5.32(R)—65 n82
5.36-54—33
5.37(R)—95
5.41(R)—65
5.42-43(R)—67
5.45(R)—87
5.63—83
5.64-65(R)—67
5.68(R)—89
5.72(R)—*19*
5.74—83
5.76(R)—127 n98
5.79(R)—65 n82
5.89(R)—*131*
5.96(R)—91
5.97(R)—91
5.129-31(R)—94, *124*
5.132-33—137
5.136-67—32
5.141-43(R)—*124*
5.143(R)—94
5.155-57—28 n9
5.156-58(R)—125 n92
5.157-58(R)—94
5.161-79—34 n22
5.198-200(R)—92
5.236-37(R)—108 n72, *145*
5.237-38(R)—*145*
5.239-43—*145-46*
5.240(R)—84
5.244(R)—82
5.259-60(R)—95
5.267(R)—95
5.272—34 n21
5.286(R)—82
5.296—34 n21
5.303—65 n82
5.304(R)—96
5.309—20
5.310-25—30 n14
5.315(R)—65 n82
5.348(R)—82
5.354-59—30 n14
5.382(R)—65 n82
5.385-86(R)—96
5.397(R)—96
5.400—65 n82
5.424(R)—82
5.430-39—28 n9
5.432(R)—92
5.461(R)—82
5.494—20
5.526-28—*139 n9*
5.526(R)—*139 n9*, *142*
5.532(R)—65 n82
5.538(R)—95
5.545(R)—82
5.558-65—32
5.570(R)—*103*
5.571-72—181
5.572(R)—95
5.583-93—31 n18
5.606-640—110
5.606(R)—81, *131*
5.624—87
5.630—83
5.657-58—132
5.682-83—142
5.684—142
5.685-95—*143*
5.685(R)—82
5.687(R)—143
5.700(R)—82
5.701-702—97, 174
5.703—147
5.721-23—181
5.727-35—32
5.730-31—169
5.738-42(R)—*151*
5.743(R)—91
5.744(R)—*146*
5.748(R)—96
5.770(R)—65, 82
5.774(R)—*19*
5.775-76(R)—137 n3, *145*

5.777(R)—93, *130*
5.778(R)—93, *130*
5.808—34 n22
5.813—146
5.822-26—*146*
5.825(R)—84

Aeneid 6
6.2(R)—93, *130*
6.4-33—32
6.9(R)—82
6.35(R)—84, 149 n26, 154 n43
6.38—91
6.39(R)—91
6.54—97
6.66—143 n16
6.68(R)—83
6.86(R)—158 n56, 163
6.91-92—158 n56
6.93(R)—23, 158 n56, *169*
6.101(R)—98
6.109—111
6.118(R)—*111*
6.124(R)—64, 90
6.125(R)—64, *111*
6.126(R)—82
6.131—82
6.158(R)—83
6.176(R)—*104*
6.190(R)—65 n82
6.232(R)—82
6.243(R)—91
6.302(R)—94, *181 n99*
6.321(R)—84
6.322—82
6.331—81
6.341(R)—64, 109
6.342(R)—109
6.348(R)—109
6.384(R)—*123 n88*
6.387(R)—64
6.403-405—*141*
6.403(R)—82
6.426-40—32
6.429(R)—*100*
6.451(R)—82
6.456(R)—83
6.465-66(R)—*151*
6.466—*159*
6.469(R)—*159*
6.499(R)—65
6.500(R)—87
6.506(R)—65
6.517-19—171
6.518-30—32
6.538(R)—64
6.547(R)—65 n82
6.560f.—111
6.562(R)—64, *111*
6.564(R)—*111*
6.592(R)—81
6.613-22—32
6.628(R)—65 n82, 84
6.642-43—126
6.648-50—126
6.660(R)—*126*
6.666(R)—64
6.679(R)—82
6.680-83(R)—*115-116*
6.688-89(R)—*151*
6.697-98(R)—*151*
6.700-702(R)—22 n2, *151*
6.713(R)—64, 82
6.757-59(R)—*116*
6.764(R)—84
6.779—138
6.792-94—126
6.796-97(R)—88
6.853—155
6.854(R)—64, 82
6.861(R)—*101*
6.866(R)—*102*
6.867(R)—64, 82
6.890—158 n56
6.891(R)—87
6.892(R)—9 n14, *114*
6.901(R)—93

Aeneid 7
7.18-21—167 n72
7.25-26(R)—66, *161 n61*
7.27—34 n21
7.30(R)—87
7.37-38—*160*
7.41(R)—160, 163
7.43(R)—87
7.55(R)—*103*
7.56(R)—84
7.72(R)—84
7.73-77—138 n6
7.79-80—138 n6
7.98—140
7.105—173 n81
7.107(R)—*103*
7.122—114
7.126—114
7.141(R)—81
7.145—114

7.146-47(R)—*161*
7.147(R)—127 n97
7.148(R)—67, *161*
7.152(R)—82
7.162-65—126
7.170-91—161 n60
7.177-81—126
7.182(R)—*125*
7.191-285—161 n60
7.195-205—163
7.205-211—*140*
7.221(R)—82
7.239-40—144
7.240(R)—*112*, *140*
7.243-48—*163*
7.245(R)—82
7.254-57—*140*
7.263—163
7.287(R)—81, *164-65*
7.304-305—164 n68
7.308(R)—81, 164 n68
7.312—76 n7
7.314(R)—84
7.319—168
7.323-40—160 n60
7.323-40—165
7.323(R)—65 n82
7.324—*157*
7.330(R)—65 n82
7.338-39—164 n68
7.341-58—161 n60
7.346—157 n53
7.347—165
7.350-51—*165*
7.354-55(R)—*165*
7.374-77—*171*
7.383-91—171
7.399(R)—*171*
7.415—157 n53
7.438(R)—81
7.440-44(R)—109
7.445-66—161 n60
7.447—157 n53
7.449(R)—65
7.452-55(R)—109
7.457—*165*
7.461-66—*175 n84*
7.461(R)—*166*
7.471(R)—65 n82
7.477-78—103
7.477—166
7.479—84
7.481-82(R)—*166-67*
7.493-94—168 n73
7.498-500—168 n73
7.546(R)—*168*
7.548(R)—*168*
7.550—168
7.558(R)—87
7.565-66(R)—95
7.570—157 n53
7.621-22—*168*
7.639-40(R)—95
7.641(R)—*107*
7.649-50(R)—*101*
7.691(R)—78, 86
7.748-49(R)—*107-108*
7.759-60—3
7.769—34 n21
7.770(R)—81
7.783-84(R)—88
7.783(R)—153 n39
7.803-804(R)—89

Aeneid 8
8.18-19—*173*
8.19-20—97
8.19(R)—*173-74*
8.20-21(R)—22 n2, 97, *174*
8.22-25—*175*
8.26-35—181
8.26-27(R)—66, 105 n66, *162 n61*, *174*
8.31(R)—87
8.35(R)—64, *105*
8.38—114
8.39(R)—114, *122*
8.40—114
8.42-49—113
8.43-46(R)—22 n2, *113*, 123
8.59(R)—105 n66
8.60-61(R)—123
8.65(R)—*122*
8.76—34 n21
8.80(R)—94, *123*
8.84(R)—81, 82
8.90(R)—*123 n88*
8.115(R)—82
8.126(R)—65
8.131—178 n90
8.132—179 n95
8.154—*84*
8.155-68—179 n95
8.155-56—176
8.157—176
8.158-62—173 n81
8.171(R)—*176*

8.175-83—176
8.175(R)—65 n82
8.182(R)—84
8.184(R)—127 n96
8.273(R)—*176*
8.284(R)—91
8.319(R)—126
8.368(R)—95
8.390(R)—97
8.398(R)—81
8.470—*84*
8.499—84
8.512—137
8.513—*84*
8.514-17—178
8.520(R)—65 n82
8.521(R)—83, 87
8.530(R)—82
8.533—137, 176 n85
8.538-39(R)—9 n14, *128*
8.541(R)—65 n82
8.542-44—146
8.542-43—91
8.544(R)—91
8.549(R)—34 n21
8.559(R)—65 n82
8.574-75(R)—*177*
8.579(R)—*177*
8.584(R)—177
8.586(R)—83, 87, 153 n39
8.589-91—101
8.596(R)—98
8.606(R)—82, 84
8.620—*138*
8.679(R)—19, *136*
8.680-81—*137*
8.680(R)—19, 23, *136-37*
8.688—84
8.689-90(R)—*124*
8.690(R)—94
8.698—136
8.699-704—136
8.704-706—149 n25
8.709(R)—23

Aeneid 9
9.2(R)—81, *132*
9.5—65 n82
9.12-13—110
9.14-15(R)—*132*
9.17(R)—65
9.69-76—132
9.77-79—107
9.97—107
9.104-106(R)—22 n2, *106-107*
9.126(R)—*105*
9.131(R)—*105*, *115*
9.159-60(R)—*115*
9.171(R)—83, 87
9.172(R)—82
9.178(R)—89
9.179-80(R)—*101*
9.188-196(R)—*111*
9.191(R)—96
9.198—149
9.204(R)—81
9.226—84
9.236-41(R)—*111*
9.247(R)—*147*
9.257—147
9.259(R)—*146*
9.263(R)—95
9.266—83, 183
9.293(R)—*103*
9.294(R)—*140*
9.310-11—*103*
9.319—66 n82
9.400-401(R)—92
9.403(R)—66 n82
9.410(R)—92
9.435-37—101
9.443—101
9.459-60(R)—22 n2, 67
9.473-87—177 n88
9.495-97—177 n88
9.502—178 n89
9.523(R)—78, 86
9.554-55(R)—92
9.569(R)—92
9.572(R)—89
9.578(R)—92
9.599(R)—109
9.601—144
9.607(R)—*108*
9.612-13(R)—*107-108*
9.625(R)—*143-44*, 148 n23, 180
9.627-28(R)—108 n72, *145*
9.631(R)—*145*
9.635(R)—109
9.640(R)—65
9.641-44—*147*
9.642-44—149
9.642—82
9.647-49(R)—*182*
9.647(R)—83
9.650-51(R)—*148*

9.652(R)—65, 149
9.657-58(R)—*148*
9.718(R)—98
9.745(R)—81
9.763(R)—93
9.779(R)—83, 87
9.802(R)—81
9.812-14(R)—92

Aeneid 10
10.1(R)—86
10.2(R)—86
10.25(R)—109
10.51-52(R)—109
10.62(R)—81
10.85(R)—109
10.86(R)—109
10.100(R)—81
10.104(R)—96
10.113-15(R)—22 n2, *106-107*
10.113(R)—23
10.118-19(R)—*115*
10.121(R)—*115*
10.127(R)—92
10.160-62—180
10.163(R)—*107*
10.195-97(R)—94, 125 n92
10.217(R)—*181*
10.218(R)—94, *181*
10.246-48—*146*
10.246—83
10.247-48—89
10.250(R)—82
10.261(R)—19, 23, *137*
10.262—138
10.270-71—*138*
10.272-75—*139*
10.276(R)—*105*
10.286(R)—82
10.332—83
10.353-54—86
10.374—180 n97
10.433-38—180
10.437(R)—87
10.461(R)—180
10.466(R)—65
10.469(R)—87
10.480—65 n82
10.491-95—154
10.515-34—180
10.524-29—155
10.532—155 n44
10.534(R)—83
10.535-36(R)—*155*
10.537-38—90
10.537(R)—84, *154*
10.538—155 n43
10.541—155 n43
10.554-55(R)—65
10.556(R)—65
10.557-60—154
10.565-70—*154 n41*
10.584(R)—82
10.591(R)—65, 82
10.597-98—155
10.613(R)—96
10.633(R)—65 n82
10.645—93
10.680—97, 174
10.685(R)—81
10.698(R)—92
10.730(R)—*106*
10.743(R)—86
10.745-46(R)—22 n2, 91
10.754(R)—89
10.760(R)—81
10.767(R)—98
10.776—93
10.781(R)—*106*
10.783(R)—82
10.789-90—134
10.821-24—154
10.824(R)—*141*
10.825-30—154
10.825(R)—*180*
10.842(R)—*134*
10.852(R)—89
10.870-71(R)—*134*
10.873(R)—65
10.877—65 n82
10.881—101
10.886(R)—82
10.896—93

Aeneid 11
11.1(R)—67, *182*
11.28(R)—*100*
11.31-33(R)—*182*
11.35(R)—*118*
11.42(R)—*180*
11.43-55—118 n84
11.45-46(R)—*110*
11.68-71—101
11.72—182
11.74-75(R)—9 n14, *182-83*
11.74(R)—83
11.76—182
11.86-90—*100*

11.89—182
11.93(R)—87
11.106(R)—82
11.107(R)—66 n82
11.132—96
11.152(R)—*111*
11.170(R)—82
11.171(R)—87
11.182-83(R)—67
11.184(R)—82
11.190—125
11.191-92(R)—*125*
11.199(R)—91
11.202(R)—88
11.208—34 n21
11.248-51(R)—*129*
11.252-54—129
11.291-92(R)—*129*
11.293—129
11.296-97—97
11.342(R)—65
11.362(R)—109
11.371—84
11.399(R)—109
11.431(R)—87
11.432-33(R)—89
11.450(R)—87
11.464-65(R)—*115*
11.479(R)—84
11.480(R)—23, *169*
11.483—84
11.522-24(R)—95
11.539(R)—89
11.550-51—174
11.557—84
11.585-91(R)—*110*
11.587-94—133
11.598(R)—87
11.603-604(R)—*115*
11.607(R)—*120*
11.647(R)—92
11.649—133
11.652(R)—*133*
11.662-63(R)—*132*
11.664-762—116
11.665—84
11.682-83(R)—89
11.685(R)—65
11.725(R)—86
11.774(R)—*133*
11.784—66 n82
11.796(R)—*120*
11.822—65 n82
11.831(R)—*102*
11.835(R)—88
11.839(R)—*120*
11.842-48(R)—*110*
11.869—83
11.875(R)—98
11.885(R)—*129*
11.904(R)—82
11.911(R)—*120*

Aeneid 12
12.17(R)—84
12.24(R)—87
12.29—34 n21
12.54(R)—172 n80
12.55(R)—172 n80
12.56(R)—172 n80
12.60—172 n80
12.64-70—170
12.66(R)—97
12.67—170 n79
12.80—84
12.81—65 n82
12.97—143 n16
12.113-14(R)—67
12.123(R)—88
12.127—83, 86
12.128(R)—78, 86
12.137(R)—87
12.141(R)—*104*
12.144(R)—*104*
12.156(R)—81
12.165(R)—88
12.166(R)—82
12.175(R)—82
12.178(R)—81, 84
12.214(R)—91
12.215(R)—91
12.228(R)—65 n82
12.254(R)—86
12.256-86—121
12.258(R)—*119*
12.260-61—*121*
12.266-67—*121*
12.266(R)—*119*
12.275(R)—*101*
12.277-80—*121*
12.281(R)—88
12.295—65 n82
12.309-310(R)—22 n2, 91
12.311(R)—82
12.318-19—40
12.319(R)—92, 119

12.330(R)—93
12.350—34 n2
12.358—66 n82
12.368(R)—*127*
12.384(R)—83, 87
12.435-40—179 n96
12.440(R)—9 n14, 82
12.441ff.—119
12.441(R)—65 n82
12.447-48(R)—97
12.460(R)—*119*
12.461(R)—*119*
12.502(R)—82
12.531(R)—92
12.549(R)—83, 86
12.550—83, 86
12.551(R)—88
12.561(R)—83, 87
12.569—153
12.577(R)—*153*
12.579-82—154
12.579(R)—*153*
12.594—*172*
12.595-96—172
12.600—170
12.607-608(R)—*172*
12.607(R)—*153*
12.630—34 n21
12.640(R)—*134*
12.641—134
12.650(R)—65 n82
12.661—83
12.666-67(R)—*134*
12.697(R)—82
12.698-99—40
12.791(R)—86
12.793—118 n83
12.794-95—118 n83
12.829(R)—*118*
12.840—158 n55
12.878(R)—*104*
12.885—65 n82
12.913(R)—*127*
12.937(R)—84
12.951(R)—*78*, *118*
12.952(R)—*102*